This is a digitally signed Gazette, to verify click here.
http://rajpatrahimachal.nic.in

राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

शनिवार, 07 फरवरी, 2026 / 18 माघ, 1947

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla, the 4th February, 2026.

No. TPT-F(2)-1/2022.—In pursuance of the powers conferred by Clause 14 of the Himachal Pradesh Pre-Paid Taxi Scheme, 2004, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to

notify, the revised rates of fare to be charged by the Pre-Paid Taxies on point-to-point basis as per attached Annexure-I.

By order,
Sd/-
R.D. NAZEEM, I.A.S.,
Additional Chief Secretary (Transport).

ANNEXURE-I

COMPLETE PROPOSED SIGHTSEEING FARE CHART (TO & FRO WITH HALTAGE) UNDER PRE-PAID TAXI SCHEME

(All amounts in Indian Rupees)

Sl. No.	Destination	Starting Point ISBT Tutikandi Shimla		Starting Point Lift Shimla		Starting Point: Sanjauli		Starting Point: IGMC Shimla	
		Taxi	Maxi	Taxi	Maxi	Taxi	Maxi	Taxi	Maxi
1.	Jakhu Mandir	₹900	₹1100	₹700	₹900	₹550	₹750	₹650	₹850
2.	Sankatmochan	₹450	₹650	₹600	₹800	₹750	₹950	₹650	₹850
3.	Taradevi Temple	₹1050	₹1250	₹1200	₹1400	₹1350	₹1550	₹1250	₹1450
4.	Kamna Devi	₹350	₹550	₹500	₹700	₹650	₹850	₹550	₹750
5.	Advanced Studies/Summer Hill	₹450	₹650	₹500	₹700	₹650	₹850	₹550	₹750
6.	Dhalli Catchment view	₹900	₹1100	₹750	₹950	₹600	₹800	₹700	₹900
7.	Catchment view, Chharabra & Wildflower Hall	₹1000	₹1200	₹850	₹1050	₹700	₹900	₹800	₹1000
8.	Chharabra & Kufri	₹1150	₹1350	₹1000	₹1200	₹850	₹1050	₹950	₹1150
9.	Chharabra, Kufri, Chail	₹2350	₹2550	₹2200	₹2400	₹2050	₹2250	₹2150	₹2350
10.	Chharabra, Kufri & Fagu	₹1450	₹1650	₹1300	₹1500	₹1150	₹1350	₹1250	₹1450
11.	Cragnano	₹1200	₹1400	₹900	₹1100	₹750	₹950	₹850	₹1050
12.	Naldehra	₹1650	₹1850	₹1400	₹1600	₹1250	₹1450	₹1350	₹1550
13.	Chamiyana Hospital	₹900	₹1150	₹750	₹950	₹600	₹800	₹700	₹900
14.	Airport Jubbar Hatti	₹1500	₹1700	₹1650	₹1850	₹1800	₹2000	₹1700	₹1900
15.	KNH	₹450	₹650	₹250	₹450	₹400	₹600	₹500	₹700
16.	Annadale	₹500	₹700	₹400	₹600	₹550	₹750	₹450	₹650
17.	Mehali	₹600	₹800	₹500	₹700	₹500	₹800	₹600	₹850
18.	Malyana	₹650	₹850	₹550	₹750	₹600	₹800	₹700	₹900
19.	BCS	₹450	₹650	₹350	₹550	₹450	₹650	₹550	₹750
20.	New Shimla Sector-IV	₹550	₹750	₹450	₹650	₹550	₹750	₹650	₹850
21.	Bharari	₹600	₹800	₹450	₹650	₹600	₹800	₹500	₹700
22.	Tara Hall	₹400	₹600	₹300	₹500	₹450	₹650	₹350	₹550
23.	Chakkar	₹350	₹550	₹450	₹650	₹600	₹800	₹500	₹700
24.	Totu	₹400	₹600	₹500	₹700	₹650	₹850	₹550	₹750
25.	Bhattakufar	₹850	₹1050	₹700	₹900	₹400	₹600	₹500	₹700
26.	Shoghi	₹700	₹900	₹800	₹1000	₹950	₹1150	₹900	₹1100

Note:

(i) All fares are inclusive of onward and return travel, with a complimentary halt period of one (1) hour**.** Waiting charges of ₹100 per hour will be applicable beyond the free halt time.

(ii) For one-way drop (pre-paid taxi service), the fare shall be 70% of the applicable round-trip (to & fro) fare**.**

LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 8th January, 2026

No. LEP-E/1/2024.—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards of the following cases announced by the **Presiding Judge, Labour Court-*cum*-Industrial Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.** on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh *i.e.* **"e-Gazette":—**

Sl. No.	Case No.	Petitioner	Respondent	Section	Date of Award/ Orders
1.	Ref. 71/2020	Ajay Bhatia	M/s D.B. Corp Ltd.	10	02-12-2025
2.	Ref. 84/2024	Gunjan Kumar Mandal	M/s ACME Generics (P) Ltd.	10	02-12-2025
3.	Ref. 26/2025	Vidya Kumari Sharma	M/s Micro Turner	10	02-12-2025
4.	Ref. 266/2020	Layak Ram	M/s SSIPL Retail Ltd.	10	03-12-2025
5.	Ref. 54/2025	Rajender Singh	M/S Aspire IIT and Medical Coaching Institute.	10	05-12-2025
6.	Ref. 38/2022	Krishna Devi	Principal Gurukul International School, Solan.	10	06-12-2025
7.	Ref. 05/2019	Gian Chand	M/s Medicef Pharma	10	08-12-2025
8.	Ref. 20/2022	Gian Chand	M/s Medicef Pharma	10	08-12-2025
9.	Ref. 41/2025	Pankaj Kumar & ors	M/s Rich Products	10	09-12-2025
10.	Ref. 143/2025	Rajeshwari	M/s Charak Pharma (P) Ltd.	10	12-12-2025
11.	Ref. 83/2019	Sanjay Thakur	Registrar, MMU, Solan	10	13-12-2025
12.	App. 54/2019	Deepan	Registrar, MMU, Solan	2A	13-12-2025
13.	Ref. 151/2025	Dhyan Singh	Registrar, MMU, Solan	10	13-12-2025
14.	Ref. 147/2024	Manoj Sharma	M/s JHS Ltd.	10	13-12-2025
15.	Ref. 75/2020	Deepak Kaushal	M/s Microtek Himachal Power Products.	10	13-12-2025
16.	Ref. 152/2024	BhimYadav	Microtek Universal Power Products.	10	13-12-2025

17.	Ref. 24/2023	Naresh Bharti	M/d Delhivery Ltd.	10	13-12-2025
18.	Ref. 64/2024	Randeep Singh	M/s SPT Ind Nahan	10	23-12-2025
19.	Ref. 59/2024	Rajmal	M/s Exicom Tele Systems	10	30-12-2025
20.	Ref. 198/2021	Janav Kumar	M/s Sweet India (P) Ltd.	10	31-12-2025

By order,

PRIYANKA BASU INGTY, IAS
Secretary (Lab. Emp. & O.P.).

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-**LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 71 of 2020

Instituted on : 24-06-2020

Decided on : 02-12-2025

Ajay Bhatia, r/o Shakuntla Bhawan, Near Amit Apartment, House No. 352, Sunny Side, Solan, District Solan, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

1. The Managing Director, M/S D.B. Corporation Limited, Plot No. 280, Sarkhej Gandhi Nagar Highway, Near YMCA Club, Makarba, Ahmedabad, Gujrat.

2. The Assistant General Manager (HR & Admin), Dainik Bhaskar, Regional Office, Plot No. 11-12, Ground Floor, Dakshin Marg, Sector-25D, Chandigarh, 160036.

3. The State Editor, Dainik Bhaskar Malbrow House, Near DPRO Office, Chotta Shimla-2, H.P. ..*Respondents.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondents : Sh. Virender Chauhan, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether the demand raised vide application/ demand notice dated 06.04.2019 (copy enclosed) by Sh. Ajay Bhatia, r/o Shakuntla Bhawan, Near Amit Apartment House No. 352, Sunny Side, Solan, District Solan, H.P. regarding verbal termination of his services w.e.f. 05.04.2019 after demanding wages and arrear of wages as per recommendations dated 11.11.2011 of the Majithia Wage Board by (1) the Managing Director, M/S D.B. Corporation Limited, Plot No. 280, Sarkhej Gandhi Nagar Highway, Near YMCA Club,

Makarba, Ahmedabad, Gujrat. (2) the Assistant General Manager (HR & Admin), Dainik Bhaskar, Regional Office, Plot No. 11-12, Ground Floor, Dakshin Marg, Sector-25D, Chandigarh, 160036. (3) the State Editor, Dainik Bhaskar Malbrow House, Near DPRO Office, Chotta Shimla-2, H.P., is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employers/ management?"

2. The case was listed for the evidence of the petitioner for today, the petitioner has still not turned up, neither anyone else has appeared on his behalf, nor any witness is present nor any steps have been taken. This was the last opportunity granted to the petitioner for evidence but despite that neither the petitioner nor any evidence is present today in the Court. As such, workman/petitioner has remained *ex parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex parte* award. This Tribunal in these

circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to lead any evidence in support of statement of claim and to argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services *w.e.f.* 05-04-2019 after demanding wages and arrear of wages as per recommendations dated 11-11-2011 of the Majithia Wage Board without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is no evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman has not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 2nd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 84 of 2024

Instituted on : 20-09-2024

Decided on : 02-12-2025

Gunjan Kumar Mandal, r/o Village Kaithpura, P.O. Barahat, Tehsil Barahat, District Banka, Bihar-813103 ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The managing director M/S Acme Generics Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 115, HPSIDC Industrial Area Davni, P.O. Gurumajra, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Sh. Ashok Kumar Thakur, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether termination of the services of Sh. Gunjan Kumar Mandal, r/o Village Kaithpura, P.O. Barahat, Tehsil Barahat, District Banka, Bihar-813103 by the managing director M/S Acme Generics Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 115, HPSIDC Industrial Area Davni, P.O. Gurumajra, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan, H.P. during October, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?"

2. The case was listed for appearance of the petitioner for today but, however, neither the petitioner nor his counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/petitioner had remained *ex-parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to

be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services during October, without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is no evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 2nd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-**LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 26 of 2025

Instituted on : 22-03-2025

Decided on : 02-12-2025

Vidya Kumari Sharma, d/o Late Sh. Hari Ram, VPO Kodakotia, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, Dsitrict Mandi, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The occupier/ Factory Manager, M/S Micro Turner, Unit-VI, Village Harraipur, Gurumajra, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Sh. Dhiraj Kanwar, Advocate.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether termination of the services of Smt. Vidyakumari Sharma d/o Late Sh. Hari Ram, VPO Kodakotia, Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, H.P. by the occupier/ Factory Manager, M/S Micro Turner, Unit-VI, Village Harraipur, Gurumajra, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. w.e.f. 09.07.2024 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?

2. Record of the conciliation has been received but no other alternative address of the petitioner is available in the record of the conciliation. Number of times notices have been issued to the petitioner but the same have been returned back undelivered for want of complete and sufficient address.

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a

Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, she is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue her case.

8. In the instant case, the petitioner could not be served for wants of complete and correct address. Thus, there is nothing on record to establish that her services were terminated *w.e.f.* 09.07.2024 was without complying with the provisions of the Act.

9. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances and also keeping in view the fact that a reference cannot be dismissed in default, the present reference is as kept **sina-die** till the day the petitioner can present in the Court and get file revives after filing appropriate application. Ordered accordingly.

Announced in the open Court today this 2nd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference No : 266 of 2020

Instituted on : 08-10-2020

Decided on : 03-12-2025

Layak Ram s/o Sh. Madan Singh, r/o Village Danda, P.O. Rajpur, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmaur, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Occupier/ Factory Manager, M/s SSIPL Retail Ltd., Village Mehruwala (Bhagani), Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Simraur, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Shri Niranjan Verma, Advocate

For the respondent : Shri Navlesh Verma, Advocate

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:—

"Whether termination of the services of Sh. Layak Ram s/o Sh. Madan Singh, r/o Village Danda, P.O. Rajpur, Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, H.P. by the management of M/s SSIPL Retail Ltd., Village Mehruwala (Bhagani), Tehsil Paonta Sahib, District Sirmaur, (H.P.) w.e.f. 30-09-2019 after conducting domestic enquiry and without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement, back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above ex-worker is entitled to from the above employer/ management?"

2. The facts as emerges from the statement of claim are that the petitioner was working as Assistant (Semi Skilled) with the respondent company since 2005, the old name of the respondent company was Reviera Pentland Pvt. Ltd. and the services of the applicant were retrenched *w.e.f.* 2006 illegally and arbitrarily. The worker union of the factory of which the petitioner was the office bearer opposed the illegal Act of the company and with the intervention of the labour and conciliation officer a written agreement was arrived on 20-06-2007 between the workers union and the management. In this agreement it was agreed by the management of the company that the services of the petitioner and some other retrenched workers will be reinstated/ taken back on old service terms and conditions as and when the new plant of the company will start at Mehruwala. In the year of 2016 when the new plant of the company started in Mehruwala, the respondent management did not obey the compromise arrived between the parties on 20-06-2007. The petitioner thus was compelled to file a complaint before the Labour Officer Paonta Sahib. He also filed a case before the Ld. Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib and after the court order the petitioner was taken back on duty. On this count the respondent management got annoyed and tried to harass and threatened to oust from him the duty. Suspension letter dated 04-04-2019 and charge sheet dated 24-04-2019 were issued to the petitioner which were replied by him. The respondent management feeling dissatisfied with the reply ordered a domestic enquiry and an enquiry officer was appointed, who conducting the enquiry in hap hazard and partial manner. Enquiry officer did not afford an opportunity of being heard to the petitioner nor the petitioner was allowed to lead any evidence. Petitioner was even not allowed to assist him in the enquiry. The enquiry officer did no recorded the version of the petitioner and even the statements of the management witnesses who deposed in favour of the petitioner were also not recorded. Enquiry officer who is also lawyer of the respondent management acted in an arbitrary manner and against the principles of natural justice gave findings against the petitioner, without any evidence on record, cogent reason and law. After conducting partial and unjust enquiry the services of petitioner were terminated *w.e.f.* 30-09-2019. Petitioner raised demand notice on 16-11-2019. Conciliation was tried but compromise could not effected due to adamant attitude of the respondent management. It has been prayed by the petitioner that he be reinstated in service with continuity, full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. Notice of this petition was sent to the respondent, in pursuance thereof, respondent filed reply whereby preliminary objections of maintainability, suppression of material facts, petitioner is trying to divert the main issue, respondent has acted in accordance with law and estopple were taken. On merits, though it was not disputed that the petitioner was working with the respondent but it was claimed that petitioner is trying to mix two different episodes and incidents in order to gain sympathy of this Court. It was not disputed that the petitioner was taken back in services in view of the compromise arrived between the parties

on 20-06-2007, but it was disputed that petitioner was taken back in service on Court order. It was submitted that suspension letter and charge sheet were served upon to the petitioner and the same were replied by him. Respondent alleged that on 04-04-2019 while being on duty at 8:40 A.M. the petitioner took up fight with one Sh. Rajesh Chauhan and threatened him with his life. During the said incident Vinod Kumar and Joginder Kumar were also present who intervened in the matter. It was claimed that the petitioner was given due opportunity and he was duly accommodate in the enquiry. He was given fair chance of being heard. It was claimed that the petitioner is trying to mislead the Court by mixing the facts of old cases and the incidents with the present case. The termination of the petitioner is legal and valid which has been made after complying with the provisions of the Act. Enquiry officer after examining four witnesses and going through their statements, found that the petitioner had in deed misbehaved and committed actions which were highly deplorable and unbecoming of an employee in the respondent organization. After receiving the domestic enquiry report, second show cause notice was issued. Reply to the said notice was filed by the petitioner but the same was found to be unsatisfactory and thus services of the petitioner were dismissed.

4. No rejoinder was filed.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 31-10-2022.

1. Whether the termination of the services of petitioner *w.e.f.* 30.09.2019, by respondent after conducing domestic enquiry and without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is illegal and unjustified? If yes, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP.*
2. Whether the claim petition is neither competent nor maintainable in the present form, as alleged? ..*OPR.*
3. Relief.

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. Besides having heard the learned Counsel for the parties, I have perused the entire case record carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

Issue No. 1 : Yes

Issue No. 2 : No

Relief :Claim petition is allowed as per operative part of the Awards.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 1

9. The onus to prove issue no. 1 is on the petitioner.

10. Coming to evidence led by the petitioner, petitioner has stepped into the witness box as PW-1 and led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition. He also tender in evidence charge sheet Ex. PW-1/B, termination

letter Ex. PW-1/C, reply to the charge sheet mark-PX-1, notice of 2-A mark-PX-2, second show cause notice mark-PX-3, settlement dated 20.06.2007 mark-PX-4 and reply to the second show cause notice mark-PX-5.

11. During cross-examination he stated that he was reengaged by the respondent on 02.03.2016 and he worked up till 04.04.2019. He denied that the on 04.04.2019 a quarrel took place between him and Rajesh, when he was on duty. He denied that the Vinod Kumar and Joginder Kumar intervened to stop the quarrel. He admitted that enquiry was held and he was found guilty in that enquiry, however he denied that he was given due opportunity to plead his version. He admitted that he had received the show cause notice dated 27.08.2019 mark-DX-1 and suspension letter mark-DX-2. He denied that his termination is legal and valid.

12. This is the entire evidence led by the petitioner.

13. In rebuttal, the respondent examined Shri Kant Kapil, as RW-1, who also tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply. He also tendered in evidence complaint Ex. RW-1/B, suspension letter Ex. RW-1/C, charge sheet Ex. RW-1/D, reply to the charge sheet Ex. RW-1/E, intimation letter Ex. RW-1/F, appointment of domestic enquiry office Ex. RW-1/G, second show cause notice Ex. RW-1/H, reply to the show cause notice Ex. RW-1/J, termination letter Ex. RW-1/K and agreement mark-RX-1.

14. During cross-examination, he admitted that the old name of respondent company was REVIERA Pentland Pvt. Ltd. He also admitted that in the year 2006 respondent company had retrenched the workers including petitioner. He showed ignorance that it was agreed upon in the agreement dated 20.07.2007 that the retrenched workers will be reinstated, when new plant of the company will start at Mehruwala, on old terms and conditions. He stated that new plant was set up at Mehruwala in the year 2010. He admitted that petitioner was not reinstated in the new plant. He further admitted that labour commissioner of HP had sent the execution petition before the Ld. Civil Judge Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib regarding the implementation of agreement and petitioner was reengaged by the respondent on the directions of Ld. Civil Judge Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib, on 02.01.2016. He admitted that no written consent of the petitioner was taken for appointment of the enquiry officer. He deposed that he was not associated in the domestic enquiry thus he cannot say that enquiry officer did not allow the petitioner to lead his evidence.

15. Respondent also examined Sh. Pankaj Vats, as RW-2, who also tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-2/A, vide he deposed that he was working as Deputy Manager, SSIPL Retail Ltd., on 04.04.2019. There was a fight between Rajesh and Layak Ram in the premises of the company and at the time Vinod and Joginder were also present there. He further stated that petitioner is quarrelsome person and he had a scuffle with Rajesh Chauhan and threatened to kill him. Enquiry conducted against the petitioner is based upon true and correct facts. Termination of the petitioner is proper and justified.

16. During cross-examination, he deposed that he was working as a Deputy Manager in the Store. Petitioner was posted in Quality department. He had deposed before the factory management and enquiry officer regarding this quarrel. No FIR was registered in the matter.

17. Respondent also examined Sh. Rajesh Chauhan, as RW-3, who also tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-3/A, vide which he deposed that petitioner is a quarrelsome person who took up fight with him and had threatened to kill him. He further deposed he was saved by Vinod and Joginder.

18. During cross-examination, he deposed that he is not a summoned witness. He further deposed that he was abused by the petitioner but admitted that petitioner had not given beatings to him. He deposed that at present he is working at Sara Industrial Area, Selaqui, Uttrakhand.

19. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent.

20. So far as the case of the petitioner is concerned, petitioner has taken the plea that he was employed with the respondent in the year 2005. He was office bearer of the union of factory and his services were retrenched in the year 2006 illegally and arbitrarily but later on there was an agreement between workers union and the management whereby it was agreed that the retrenched workers including the petitioner will be reinstated/ taken back at new plant of the company at Mehruwala. The petitioner has alleged that even after the plant was set up at Mehruwala, the respondent did not comply with the agreement, as such execution was filed before the Ld. Court No. 1 Paonta Sahib and petitioner was taken back on duty on Court orders. The case further set up by the petitioner is that due to this reason respondent had grudges against him, thus respondent issued suspension order and chargesheet and conducted a malafied partial enquiry which was against the principles of natural justice and thereafter terminated the services of the petitioner illegally.

21. On the other hand, respondent has taken the plea that petitioner is trying to mix two different episodes and the incidents. Since the petitioner had taken up quarrel with Sh. Rajesh Chauhan (RW-3) enquiry was conducted in the matter and enquiry officer had found the petitioner guilty and thereafter second show cause notice was issued to the petitioner and reply to the same was filed by him but respondent management was not satisfied with the reply of the petitioner thus services of the petitioner were terminated/ dismissed. Though, the respondent has examined three witnesses and has tried to establish on record that the petitioner had quarrel with RW-3 and in this regard enquiry was conducted which was fair and proper but respondent has not bothered to examine the enquiry officer. The enquiry proceedings have not been placed on record, nor the enquiry officer has been examined to establish on record that a fair and proper enquiry was conducted or that due opportunities of being heard was granted to the petitioner. On the basis of RW-1 to RW-3 it cannot be held that the enquiry conducted by the respondent was fair and proper and the same was conducted as per the principles of natural justice. Since, the enquiry officer has not been examined nor the enquiry proceedings have been produced on record, thus this Court has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the services of the petitioner have been terminated illegally by the respondent. Accordingly, the dismissal order dated 30.09.2019 is set aside and quashed.

22. Now, the last question which has been raised by the petitioner through this claim petition is that he is not only entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity but also for back-wages. The petitioner in his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A has averred that he is not gainfully employed and after his termination his family is on the verge of starvation as he is the only bread earner in the family. It is settled that the entitlement of any employee to get re-instated does not necessarily and mechanically result in payment of full or partial back-wages which is independent of re-instatement and host of factors like the manner and method of selection and appointment, nature of appointment whether ad-hoc, short term, daily wage, temporary and permanent in character and length of service, which the workman had rendered with the employer, are required to be taken into consideration before passing any order for award of back-wages. This position was reiterated in **Kanpur Electricity Supply C. Ltd. Vs. Shamim Mirza (2009) 1 SCC 20** as well as in **Ritu Marbles Vs. Prabhankant Shukla (2010) 2 SCC 70**.

23. In the case in hand the petitioner has shown that he was not gainfully employed anywhere. In **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan Versus S.C. Sharma (2005) SCC 363**, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that in question of determining the entitlement of a person to back wages, the employee has to show that he/she was not gainfully employed. The initial burden is on the employee to prove that. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **National Gandhi Musuem Vs. Sudhir Sharma (2-21) 12 SCC 439** has considered this aspect and held as under:—

"Whether an employee after dismissal from service was gainfully employed is something, which is within his special knowledge. Considering the principle incorporated in Section 106 of the Indian

Evidence Act, the initial burden is on the employee to come out with the case that he was not gainfully employed after the order of termination. It is a negative burden, however, in what manner the employee can discharge the said burden will depend upon peculiar facts and circumstances of each case. It all depends on the pleadings and evidence on record. Since it is a negative burden, in a given case, an assertion on oath by the employee that he was unemployed, may be sufficient compliance in the absence of any positive material brought on record by the employer."

24. Coming to the case in hand, it stands established that the petitioner was engaged as Assistant (semi-skilled) in the year 2005 and he worked uptill 30.09.2019, when his services were illegally dismissed by the respondent. Petitioner has worked about fourteen years with the respondent continuously as such in view of the continuous service which has been rendered by the petitioner with the respondent and in view of the fact that petitioner has discharged the initial burden put on his to show that he is not gainfully employed anywhere and this burden has not been rebutted by the respondent it stands established on record that the petitioner is not gainfully employed after his dismissal as such he is also entitled to full back-wages.

25. Keeping view the aforesaid discussion, the petitioner is held entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity along-with full back-wages. The dismissal order dated 30.09.2019 is hereby set aside and quashed. Accordingly issue no. 1 decided in favour of the petitioner.

ISSUE NO. 2

26. So far as issue No. 2 is concerned, the respondent has not led any evidence to establish on record that as to how the present claim petition is not maintainable. Moreover, the present claim petition has been filed by the petitioner pursuant to the reference received from the appropriate government for adjudication. I find nothing wrong with this petition which is perfectly maintainable in the present form. The issue no. 2 in question is answered in negative.

RELIEF:

27. As a sequel to my findings on issues no.1 & 2, the claim filed by the petitioner succeeds and is hereby partly allowed. The respondent management is directed to re-instate the petitioner *w.e.f.* 30-09-2019 with seniority and continuity, with full back-wages.

28. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after due completion be tagged with the main case file.

Announced in the open Court today on this 3rd day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number	: 54 of 2025
Instituted on	: 16-07-2025
Decided on	: 05-12-2025

Rajender Singh s/o Sh. Mangat Ram, c/o Sh. Subash Pathania Advocate, Ram Niwas Old Beer Khana, Shimla, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

Yoginder Kumar Meena (Managing Director), M/s Aspire IIT and Medical Coaching Institute, Near HDFC Bank BCS, New Shimla, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Ms. Muskan Gupta, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether termination of the services of Sh. Rajender Singh s/o Sh. Mangat Ram, c/o Sh. Subash Pathania Advocate, Ram Niwas Old Beer Khana, Shimla, H.P., by Sh. Yoginder Kumar Meena (Managing Director), M/s Aspire IIT and Medical Coaching Institute, Near HDFC Bank BCS, New Shimla, H.P. w.e.f. 20-11-2022 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 as alleged by the workman, is legal and justified? If not, what relief of reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above managements?"

2. The case was listed for appearance of the parties for today but, however, neither the petitioner nor his counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/petitioner had remained *ex parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a

Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of his services *w.e.f.* 20-11-2022 was without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 5th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA, CAMP AT SOLAN**.

Reference No. : 38 of 2022

Instituted on : 14-02-2022

Decided on : 06-12-2025

Krishna Devi w/o Shri Virender Mohan r/o Koti, PO Galang, Tehsil & District Shimla, HP.

VERSUS

The Director/Principal, Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Bye Pass, Kather, Tehsil and District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Shri Neeraj Mehta, Advocate

For the respondent : Shri Alok Bhardwaj, Advocate

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:—

"Whether the transfer of Smt. Krishna Devi w/o Shri Virender Mohan r/o Koti, P.O. Galang, Tehsil & District Shimla, HP by the Director/ Principal, Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Bye Pass, Kather, Tehsil & District Solan, HP from her present Solan place of posting to Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Kunihar, without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, to what benefit and compensation the aggrieved workman is entitled from the above employer?"

2. The facts which emerges from the statement of claim are that the petitioner/workman was employed as Nanny (caretaker of babies) by the respondent School since 2011 to 2020 on monthly salary of Rs. 6700/-. Though, the work and performance of the petitioner was satisfactory as no chargesheet or warning was issued to her, but the principal of the respondent school, supervisor and Director ordered the petitioner to work in their residences in the pay she was getting to work in the School. Petitioner denied to work at the residences of these officials, then she was abused and humiliated and was threatened to be transferred to some other branch or that her services would be terminated. The petitioner was getting treatment from EIS Dispensary and thereafter from NAV Jeevan nursing Home and in this regard she had intimated the principal of the school and also moved an application for leave, but her application was not received by the Principal. Respondent transferred the petitioner to Kunihar Branch *vide* letter dated 08.10.2020 whereby she was directed to join at Kunihar Branch on 16.10.2020. On 15.10.2020, petitioner applied for medical leave to Principal of the respondent School at Kuther (Solan), but her application was not received by stating that she has been transferred to Kunihar and she shall apply for the medical leave at Kunihar branch. Petitioner has claimed that at the time of her appointment, no other branch of the school existed and she had been appointed to work at Gurukul International School Solan. The terms and condition of transfer was also not mentioned at the time of appointment of the petitioner. Petitioner is single mother of girl child and any adverse transfer will affect the studies of her daughter. Transfer has been ordered just to create a situation for the petitioner to resign from job or her services could be terminated for non-compliance of transfer order. The respondent has not followed the principles of natural justice. Petitioner could not join her duties at transferred place and she remained unemployed. Petitioner has no source of income, thus petitioner has prayed for her re-engagement at Solan branch with full back-wages and continuity in service from the date of her transfer.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent, in pursuance thereof respondent contested the claim by filing reply, wherein preliminary objections of maintainability, estoppel, petitioner while working in the School refused the work assigned by the superiors and when she was asked to do her duties she talked

disrespectfully, in unparliamentarily language, spoke to her superiors by using abusive language and sarcastic comments. On 04.06.2020 the petitioner misbehaved with the coordinator of the school Smt. Sunita Thakur when she asked the petitioner to sign the letter. The petitioner not only refused to sign the letter, but also stated in loud voice that do whatever she wants to do, in front of the employees, other staff members and teachers of the school. Management issued warning letter to the petitioner on 9.6.2020, but the attitude of the petitioner remained the same and she again and again did serious misconducts in the school premises in front of the employees, teachers, staff and students of the school. It was further averred that the petitioner has not complied with the transfer orders dated 6.10.2020 and she has not joined her duties at Kunihar school till date. Respondent management wrote several letters to the petitioner to join her services at Kunihar, but in vain, the petitioner abandoned her services at her own sweet will and never joined her services at Kunihar School till date. The school has two branches *i.e.* one is situated at Solan city and another is situated at Kunihar town, as such the school management has right to transfer its employees or staff from one branch to another. It was reiterated that the petition is neither competent nor maintainable. On merits, though it was not denied that the petitioner was employed as Nany as claimed by her, but reiterated that on 4-6-2020 and 6-6-2020, the petitioner misbehaved with her superiors and thereafter warning letter dated 9-6-2020 was issued. It was denied that the petitioner had informed the principal of the school regarding medical leave or moved any application for leave. It was disputed that petitioner could not joined at Kunihar Branch and remained unemployed. A false story has been cooked up by the petitioner, with motive to extort pecuniary benefits from the respondent and prayed for the dismissal of the claim.

4. Rejoinder to the reply was filed by the petitioner in which she denied the preliminary objections and reiterated the averments as made in the petition.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 07-01-2023.

1. Whether the transfer of petitioner from her present Solan place of posting to Gurkul International Sr. Sec. School Kunihar, without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Dispute Act 1947 is illegal and unjustified? If yes, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP.*

2. Whether the claim petition filed by the petitioner is neither competent nor maintainable in the present form, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

3. Relief.

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. I have heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties and have also gone through the record with care.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:—

Issue No. 1	:	Yes. Entitled to reinstatement with seniority and continuity along-with full back-wages.
Issue No. 2	:	No
Relief	:	Reference is answered in affirmative as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 1.

9. The onus to prove issue No. 1 is on the petitioner.

10. Coming to evidence led by the petitioner, petitioner stepped into the witness box as PW-1 and led her evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the petition.

11. During cross-examination, she deposed that she was engaged for stitching work. She denied that she refused to do the work allotted to her and further denied that she used to speak in abusive language and made sarcastic remarks to her superiors. She denied that she misbehaved with Sunita Thakur on 4-6-2020 and refused to sign and further denied that she used abusive language about the Direcor and Principal on 6-8-2020. She deposed that she had not received any warning letter from the school on 09-06-2020. She denied that *vide* office order dated 9-8-2020, she was fined `2,000/-. She admitted that letter dated 11-8-2020 has been written by her. She denied that she extended threat to commit suicide along-with her daughter on 7-8-2020. She admitted that respondent school has branches at Solan, Kandaghat and Kunihar. She admitted that she was transferred *vide* transfer letter dated 6-8-2020. She admitted that she was asked to join on 1-12-2020 vide letter dated 25-10-2020. She admitted that till date she has not joined her duties at Kunihar. She deposed that she cannot join duty at Kunihar, as she is a single parent of a girl child. She denied that she has abandoned the job herself. She further denied that she is gainfully employed.

12. Shri Hem Raj was examined by the petitioner as PW-2, who led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. PW-2/A, wherein he deposed that he worked as security guard with respondent school from 2019 to August 2022 and he knows the petitioner who worked as a nanny with the respondent. He further deposed that in his presence principal Smt. Gurpreet Mathur, Director Shri Sunil Garg and Shri Dinesh Garg used to take the work of cook and sweeper from the petitioner in their private houses and when the petitioner refused to do the work, she was transferred to Kunihar Branch.

13. During cross-examination, he deposed that he has not produced any document regarding his appointment. He admitted that he was also a witness in reference no. 146 of 2022. He denied that he had left the job at his own, but stated that he has not raised any dispute.

14. This is the entire evidence led by the petitioner.

15. In order to rebut the evidence of the petitioner, respondent examined Shri Luckhvinder Arora, as RW-1, who also led his evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is reproduction of the averments as made in the reply.

16. During cross-examination, he deposed that he is working as Principal in the respondent School since Jan., 2022. He deposed that he has not placed on record any file regarding work & conduct of the petitioner. He further stated that Shri Dinesh Garg Director is hale and hearty. Worker of group D can be deputed to work there in the residences of Director and Principal, which are situated in the school premises.

17. The other witness examined by the respondent is Ms. Sunita Tomar, Supervisor of respondent school, who stepped into the witness box as RW-2 and led her evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-2/A. She also placed on record letter dated 26-05-2020 as Ex. RW-2/B, warning letter dated 09-06-2020 as Ex. RW-2/C, office order dated 07-08-2020 as RW-2/D, transfer letter dated 06.10.2020 as Ex. RW-2/E, letter dated 25-10-2020 Ex. RW-2/F and letter dated 11-12-2020 Ex. RW-2/G.

18. During cross-examination, she admitted that letters Ex. RW-2/C to Ex. RW-2/G and document Mark A have been signed by former Principal Smt. Gurmeet Mathur. She further showed ignorance whether any other person except petitioner was transferred to other school. She deposed that the petitioner used do cleaning, dusting work etc. She denied that the petitioner was engaged for stitching work.

19. Ms. Simran Thakur, Front Executive Officer appeared into the dock as RW-3, who led her evidence by way of affidavit Ex. RW-3/A which is also a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply.

20. During cross-examination, she deposed that petitioner used to work as nanny. She deposed that the work of nanny was of cleaning and dusting of the office, but the petitioner refused to do the cleaning work. She showed ignorance that when the petitioner refused to work in the house of Director, she was transferred to Kunihar. She admitted that documents Ex. RW-2/B to Ex. RW-2/G and document Mark A have been signed by Smt. Gurmeet Mathur, former principal of the school.

21. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent.

22. So far as the claim of the petitioner is concerned, the petitioner has claimed that she worked as nanny with the respondent school which fact has not been disputed by the respondent. It is also not disputed that the petitioner was engaged as Nanny since 2011 and worked till 2020 and was getting salary of ` 6700/- per month. The petitioner has alleged that she was forced to do house hold works in the house of Director and other officials of the School which she refused to do and due to this reason she was transferred to Kunihar Branch of the respondent school without there being any stipulation of transfer in her the appointment letter, in utter violation of the mandatory provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter to be referred as the Act) whereas the respondent has taken the plea that the petitioner while working in the school refused to do the work assigned to her by her superiors and whenever she was asked to do her duties, she used to talk disrespectfully by using unparliamentarily and abusive language. It is further the plea of respondent that a show cause notice was issued to the petitioner and thereafter she was transferred to Kunihar Branch, but she did not join her duties at transferred place and as such she abandoned the job herself. So far as these allegations and counter allegations are concerned, no appointment letter has been produced by either of the parties nor the respondent has produced on record any by laws of the respondent school to establish on record that the respondent school had right to transfer the petitioner to its other branch. The petitioner has taken a very specific plea that at the time of her appointment there was no stipulation that her services could be transfer, as such, onus was heavily on the respondent to prove on record that they could transfer the services of the petitioner to the other branch of the respondent school at Kunihar, in view of the stipulation in the appointment letter or under the clause(s) of the by-laws of the school. Since, neither the appointment letter has been produced nor any by-laws have been produced by the respondent, it is to be presume that there was no clause of transfer either in the appointment letter or under the by-laws of the respondent school to transfer the petitioner to its other branch.

23. Though, the respondent has taken the plea that the petitioner was disobedient and she was not following the commands of her superiors and had also misbehaved with school coordinator and principal, but neither any chargesheet has been issued to the petitioner nor any enquiry has been conducted against her to prove such allegations. From the record, it appears that the respondent school chose to transfer the petitioner to some other branch without there being any stipulation for transfer of the petitioner in the appointment letter or in the by-laws.

24. In view of the discussion made above, it stands established that the transfer order of the petitioner has been issued to her in utter violation of the mandatory provisions of the Act as no notice of change of service conditions has been issued to the petitioner.

25. Though, at the time of arguments, Ld. counsel for the respondent had taken the plea that respondent has not terminated the services of the petitioner but she has abandoned the job at her own by not joining the duties at transferred place and remained absent. So far as this plea of abandonment is concerned, neither any enquiry has been conducted nor opportunity of being heard was afforded to the petitioner before or after transferring her to some other branch. It is well known that abandonment has to be proved by the employer like any other fact. Therefore, the burden of proving of abandonment is upon the respondent. It has been laid down by our own Hon'ble High Court in case titled as ***Narain Singh vs. The State of Himachal Pradesh & Ors., 2016 (3) Him L.R. 1875*** that voluntary abandonment of work by a workman is required to be established by way of cogent and reliable evidence by the employer. Similarly, in case titled as ***State of Himachal Pradesh & another vs. Shri Partap Singh, 2017 (1) Him L.R. 286***, it has been held by our own Hon'ble High Court that abandonment is not to be lightly presumed, but it has to be unequivocally proved by the employer. Simply because a workman fails to report for duty, it cannot be presumed that he/she has left/abandoned the job.

26. Admittedly, no disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner by the respondent for her alleged willful absence from duty after transferring her to some other branch. Absence from duty is a serious misconduct and the principle of natural justice did require that some sort of a fact finding inquiry was got conducted by the respondent. In the present case as it emerges from the evidence on record, so was not done by the respondent. Then, '*animus'* to abandon, it is well settled, must necessarily be shown to exist, before a case of abandonment can be said to have been made out. No evidence of any such '*animus'* on the part of the petitioner is forthcoming in the present case. Thus, the plea of abandonment put forth by the respondent/employer is not established. There is no strength in the plea taken by the respondent that the petitioner has abandoned the job.

27. At the time of arguments, it was argued that at no point of time the respondent has not terminated the services of the petitioner as such there is no official termination of the petitioner which could be set aside. So far as this plea of respondent is concerned, admittedly the respondent *vide* letter dated 6-10-2020 Ex. RW-2/E, transferred the petitioner and she was asked to join the duties at Kunihar on 16.10.2020. In Ex. RW-2/E no date of joining has been mentioned, however, in letter dated 25-10-2020 Ex. RW-2/F, it is mentioned that the petitioner was to join her duties on 16.-10-2020, but since the petitioner was un-well, she was directed to join her duties at Kunihar on 01-12-2020. Therefore chargesheet Ex. RW-2/G was issued to the petitioner, but there is nothing on record that when this chargesheet was served on the petitioner and thereafter what action was taken on this chargesheet by the respondent. Admittedly no enquiry has been conducted in the matter by the respondent. Since, the plea of the respondent is that the petitioner has abandoned the job which plea has not been proved in accordance with law it tantamount to oral termination of the petitioner by the respondent. It has already been held by this Court that transfer of the petitioner from Solan to Kunihar branch is not supported either by her appointment letter or by-laws as such the same is violative of the principles of natural justice.

28. In view of my foregoing discussion, it is held that the transfer of petitioner by the respondent from Solan to Kunihar branch without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the mandatory provisions of the Act is illegal and unjustified. The petitioner is held entitled to be reinstated in service on the same post and place where she was working prior to her transfer *i.e.* **at Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Kather Bye Pass, Solan, HP with seniority and continuity.**

29. Now, the last question which has been raised by the petitioner through this claim petition is that she is not only entitled for reinstatement with seniority and continuity but also for back-wages. The petitioner in her statement of claim as well as by way of affidavit Ex. PW-1/A the petitioner has averred that

she is unemployed since the date of her termination. It is settled that the entitlement of any employee to get re-instated does not necessarily and mechanically result in payment of full or partial back-wages which is independent of re-instatement and host of factors like the manner and method of selection and appointment, nature of appointment whether *ad-hoc*, short term, daily wage, temporary and permanent in character and length of service, which the workman had rendered with the employer, are required to be taken into consideration before passing any order for award of back-wages. This position was reiterated in **Kanpur Electricity Supply C. Ltd. Vs. Shamim Mirza (2009) 1 SCC 20** as well as in **Ritu Marbles Vs. Prabhankant Shukla (2010) 2 SCC 70**.

30. In the case in hand the petitioner has shown that she was not gainfully employed anywhere. In **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan Versus S.C. Sharma (2005) SCC 363**, the Hon'ble Apex Court held that in question of determining the entitlement of a person to back wages, the employee has to show that he/she was not gainfully employed. The initial burden is on the employee to prove that. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **National Gandhi Musuem Vs. Sudhir Sharma (2-21) 12 SCC 439** has considered this aspect and held as under:—

> *"Whether an employee after dismissal from service was gainfully employed is something, which is within his special knowledge. Considering the principle incorporated in Section 106 of the Indian Evidence Act, the initial burden is on the employee to come out with the case that he was not gainfully employed after the order of termination. It is a negative burden, however, in what manner the employee can discharge the said burden will depend upon peculiar facts and circumstances of each case. It all depends on the pleadings and evidence on record. Since it is a negative burden, in a given case, an assertion on oath by the employee that he was unemployed, may be sufficient compliance in the absence of any positive material brought on record by the employer."*

31. Coming to the case in hand, it stands established that the petitioner was engaged as Nanny by the respondent in the year 2011 and she worked up till the year 2020, when her services were illegally transferred by the respondent without serving prior notice of change in service conditions and without complying with the mandatory provisions of the Act. Petitioner has worked about nine years with the respondent school continuously as such in view of the continuous service which has been rendered by the petitioner with the respondent and in view of the fact that petitioner has discharged the initial burden put on her to show that she is not gainfully employed anywhere and this burden has not been rebutted by the respondent it stands established on record that the petitioner is not gainfully employed after her oral termination as such she is also entitled to full back-wages and accordingly issue No.1 is answered in favour of the petitioner.

ISSUE NO. 2

32. Now coming to issue no. 2, there is nothing on record that as to how this petition is neither competent nor maintainable. The present reference petition has been sent to this Court by the appropriate Government for adjudication and the same is maintainable before this Court, hence, issue no. 2 decided against the respondent.

RELIEF.

33. In view of my aforesaid discussion, the claim filed by the petitioner succeeds and is hereby allowed. The respondent school is directed to re-engage the petitioner in service forth-with with seniority and continuity along-with full back-wages on the same post and place where she was working prior to her transfer *i.e.* **Gurukul International Senior Secondary School, Kather Bye Pass, Solan, HP**. The respondent school is directed to pay the back-wages within a period of two months from the date of

announcement of this award failing which the same shall carry interest @ 9% per annum. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

34. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after due completion be tagged with the main case file.

Announced in the open Court today on this 6th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE,
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 05 of 2019

Instituted on : 01-01-2019

Decided on : 08-12-2025

Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, HP. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, HP. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Shri Narender Verma, Adv.

For the Respondent : Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether demands of Shri Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, HP raised vide demand notice dated 23.06.2018 (copy enclosed) before the Labour Officer Baddi and the Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, HP are legal and justified? If yes, what relief the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?"

2. The case of the petitioner, as it emerges from the statement of claim is that he is a workman as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred as the Act) and was engaged as store

supervisor in Storage Department of the respondent company *w.e.f.* 20-0-.2011 and had worked as such till 14-06-2018. Neither increments in parity with other workers have been given to him nor he was promoted. Workmen junior to him were getting periodic increments and their salaries/wages were also on higher side. As the petitioner while doing his duty had found discrepancies in the entries of detail of stock and had reported the same to the Head of Factory through e-mails, the Maintenance Manager, Purchase Manager and official of the HR Department got annoyed and had hatched a conspiracy to harass him financially, mentally and physically. Even, his wages and monetary benefits were reduced and he was not granted leave during the pregnancy of his wife, who as such could not get proper medical care. Due to receipt of letter sent by the respondent by his wife she got depressed and due to this the child in her womb got aborted. Petitioner has claimed that he was not granted the promotion and other increase in the salary/wages and was paid increment less than other similar situated workers/employees and when he made a request for promotion, increase in monetary benefits etc., he was suspended *vide* suspension letter dated 14-06-2018 and false charges were levelled *vide* chargesheet dated 04-07-2018. He filed reply to the suspension and chargesheet, but of no avail. Respondent company has adopted inimical attitude towards the petitioner and levelled false allegations against the petitioner. Due to discrimination of the petitioner by the respondent company, the petitioner is on the verge of starvation as he has no source of income. The unlawful dismissal of the petitioner by the respondent company itself is victimization by way of adopting unlawful means. Petitioner raised demand notice before the Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer in which the respondent company was duly served, however, due to adamant attitude of the respondent company, the conciliation proceedings failed and the matter was sent to this Court as reference for adjudication. The petitioner has prayed that the dismissal order dated 31-10-2018 be set aside and he be reinstated in service with all the consequential service benefits including full back-wages. Petitioner further prayed that his demands be allowed. The claim is duly supported with the affidavit of petitioner.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent and in pursuance thereof the petition was contested by the respondent by filing reply wherein the respondent took preliminary objections regarding lack of maintainability, concealment of material facts, the petitioner is not a workman as he was appointed as a supervisor and that the reference is not a legal one. By asserting an additional plea, the respondent has contended that during the course of his employment, the petitioner had indulged in grave misconduct, hence an independent, fair and impartial enquiry into the misconduct was got conducted by an independent person. The enquiry officer conducted the enquiry as per the principles of the natural justice by affording full opportunity to attend the same, but the petitioner had failed to attend the enquiry proceedings on trifle matters and as such the enquiry officer had proceeded him ex-parte. The petitioner is stated to be gainfully employed and earning more than the amount which he was earning from the respondent. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Supervisor (Engineering Store) on 02-04-2012 at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/-. It was enhanced from time to time and at the time of his dismissal the petitioner was being paid Rs. 19,500/- per month. The duties assigned to him were purely supervisory in nature, hence the provisions of the Act are not attracted in this case. The petitioner had been insisting to be promoted as Manager/ Assistant Manager (Engineering Store), but the respondent refused as there was no post of Manager Engineering Store. It is denied that the salary of the petitioner was on the lower side. It is admitted that the suspension order and charge-sheet were served upon the petitioner. A Civil Suit for recovery of damages for wrongful termination in the Court of Senior Civil Judge, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, HP has been filed by the petitioner against the respondent, on the same cause of action. After adopting the legal recourse, his services were rightly dismissed by the respondent. By denying the other allegations, the respondent has prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

4. While filing the rejoinder, the petitioner controverted the averments made in the reply and reiterated those in the statement of claim.

5. Out of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for determination and adjudication by this Court, *vide* order dated 23.08.2021:

1. Whether the demand raised by demand notice dated 23.06.2018 to be fulfilled by the management are legal and justified? ..*OPP.*

2. If issue no.1 is proved in affirmative then what relief petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the claim petition is not maintainable in the present form? ..*OPR.*

4. Relief:

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. Besides having heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties, I have also gone through the record of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues, my findings thereon are as under:—

Issue No. 1	: Redundant.
Issue No. 2	: Redundant.
Issue No. 3	: Yes.
Relief	: Reference is answered in the Negative, as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 3.

9. Issue no.3 is taken up first for determination as the main contention of the respondent at the time of filing reply as well as addressing arguments is that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as defined under Section 2-S of the Act.

10. Per the respondent, the petitioner at the time of dismissal was drawing salary of Rs. 19,500/- per month and was primarily performing supervisory duties, as such does not fall within the preview of "workman", as contemplated under Section 2(s) of the Act. As per the respondent the petitioner was appointed initially on 02-04-2012 as supervisor (Engineering Store) at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/- and his salary was enhanced from time to time. Thus, per the respondent the present reference is not maintainable as the petitioner does not fall within the definition of the "workman".

11. The petitioner no doubt has admitted that he was engaged in the store department of the respondent company as supervisor, and he was engaged on 20.05.2011. As per the petitioner, he squarely falls within the definition of "workman".

12. Now, coming to the evidence which has been led by the petitioner to prove his case, he has appeared into the witness box as PW-1 and tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the claim petition. The petitioner also tendered in evidence suspension letter dated 14.06.2018 Ex. PW-1/B, letter of change designation Mark PA Chargesheet Mark PB, demand letters Mark PC and Mark PD, e-mails Mark PE-1 to Mark PE-49 and demand notice Ex. PW-1/C, documents Mark PX-1 to Mark PX-19.

13. During cross-examination, he denied that he joined as Engineering Supervisor Store on 2-4-2012. He admitted that vide detail increment sheet Ex. R-1, he was granted annual increments from time to time. He further admitted that the reply Ex. R-2 was filed by the respondent to demand notice dated 23-06-2018. He denied that he filed false complaints against the respondent with the Police. He admitted that the respondent issued charge sheet to him and enquiry was conducted against him. He further admitted that his services were terminated *vide* letter dated 31-10-2018 and he was paid a sum of Rs. 1,07,619/-. He admitted that he had filed a civil suit in the Court of Civil Judge Sunder Nagar claiming damages of Rs. 20 lakhs from the respondent.

14. The respondent on the other hand examined Shri Sanjay Jain as RW-1 who also tendered in evidence affidavit Ex. RW-1/A which is reproduction of averments as made in the reply.

15. During cross-examination this witness has admitted that the petitioner was appointed on 2-4-2012 on monthly wages of Rs. 19500/-. He deposed that the petitioner was appointed to the post of Store Supervisor and he used to supervise, prepare inventory and account all the material brought inside the factory through invoices. He denied that proper increment was not given to the petitioner. He further denied that the petitioner was wrongly chargesheeted. He also denied that the petitioner was subjected to physical, financial and mental torture. He denied that the services of the petitioner were terminated during the pendency of reference no. 20 of 2022.

16. It, thus, emerges from the facts on record that the petitioner admittedly was appointed in the storage department of the respondent company as Supervisor store. It is also admitted that the last drawn salary of the petitioner was around Rs. 19,500/-. The petitioner has admitted that since he was working as supervisor in the store and was discharging the duties which were supervisory in nature.

17. Before adverting any further, it would be apposite to venture into the legal aspect of the matter, as to whether the petitioner would fall within the terms of Section 2(s) of the Act. The Section read and under:—

> "*Workman" means any person (including an apprentice employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person-*
>
> > *(i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or*
> >
> > *(ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or*
> >
> > *(iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or*

(iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, function mainly of a managerial nature.

18. The definition itself stipulates as to who a workman would be. However, clauses-l to IV are the exceptions, which have been carved out to say that the following would not fall within the category of a "workman" (in our case clauses- III and IV is relevant to be noticed). The bare reading of the Section shows that a person who is employed in a managerial or administrative capacity would not fall within the term of workman and the person who is employed in a supervisory capacity and draws wages exceeding Rs.10,000/- per mensem and discharges functions mainly of a managerial or supervisory in nature would also not come within the purview of the term "workman".

19. Viewed in this context, the admissions made by the petitioner in his cross-examination shows that he had been assigned the duties which were primarily supervisory in nature and that his last drawn salary was Rs. 19,500/-. No doubt, the work or the job profile of the petitioner has not been brought on record by the respondent, but it is by now well settled that the admissions are the best piece of evidence. The admissions made by the petitioner, as discussed aforesaid would go to show that he was employed in the supervisory capacity and had been drawing wages exceeding Rs. 10,000/- mensem and that he had been assigned duties of supervisory nature.

20. Though, in determining the nature of work, the designation of the employee or the name assigned to him should not be given due importance. The primary duty performed by the person is to be given due importance but coming to the case in hand there is no evidence worth the name to suggest that the petitioner was doing any other duties except to supervise the work in the respondent company**. In Somnath Tulshi Ram Galande Vs. Presiding Officer, IInd Labout Court Pune and others 2008 (4) Mh.L.J 163, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held as under:—**

"Where a particular workman is a supervisor within or without the definition of "workman" is "ultimately a question of fact, at best one of mixed fact and law" and "will really depend upon the nature of the industry, the type of work in which he is engaged, the organizational setup of the particular unit of industry and the like factors."

21. The Hon'ble High Court had come to record a finding in the aforesaid case that the appellant therein was undertaking supervisory and managerial work as such he was not covered under the definition of "workman".

22. Similarly, in **S.K. Maini v. Carona Sahu Co. Ltd., 1994 AIR 1824,** the Supreme Court has held as under:—

"After giving our careful consideration to the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the parties, it appears to us that whether or not an employee is a workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act is required to be determined with reference to his principal nature of duties and functions. Such question is required to be determined with reference to the facts and circumstances of the case and materials on record and it is not possible to lay down any straitjacket formula which can decide the dispute as to the real nature of duties and functions being performed by an employee in all cases. When an employee is employed to do the types of work enumerated in the definition of workman under Section 2(s), there is hardly any difficulty in treating him as a workman under the appropriate classification but in the complexity of industrial or commercial organizations quite a large number of employees are often

required to do more than one kind of work. In such cases, it becomes necessary to determine under which classification the employee will fall for the purpose of deciding whether he comes within the definition of workman or goes out of it ...the designation of an employee is not of much importance and what is important is the nature of duties being performed by the employee. The determinative factor is the main duties of the employee concerned and not some works incidentally done. In other words, what is, in substance, the work which employee does or what in substance he is employed to do. Viewed from this angle, if the employee is mainly doing supervisory work but incidentally or for a fraction of time also does some manual or clerical work, the employee should be held to be doing supervisory works. Conversely, if the main work is of manual, clerical or of technical nature, the mere fact that some supervisory or other work is also done by the employee incidentally or only a small fraction of working time is devoted to some supervisory works, the employee will come within the purview of 'workman' as Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

The appellant in the present case had multifarious duties and most of his duties were supervisory and managerial. He had the power and capacity to take decisions, supervise work of others and was also responsible for quality control of the products being manufactured. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the documentary and oral evidence led by the parties, it can be concluded that the appellant was not a 'workman' within the definition of Section 2(s) of the Act. Looking into the admission of the workman and specific language of Exhibit 29 and the terms and conditions of his appointment, it is difficult to arrive at any conclusion other than the one arrived at by the Labour Court and the learned single Judge in the impugned order."

23. Coming to the case in hand from the demand notice Ex. PW-1/C, it is clear that the first demand which the petitioner has raised through demand notice Ex. PW-1/C before the management of respondent is that his designation be changed to Engineer Store Manager and his salary, increment, bonus and all other benefits be given to him at par with other Manager Store. Had the petitioner being skilled of unskilled workers, he could not have claimed the benefits of Manager vide demand notice Ex. PW-1/C. The demand notice Ex. PW-1/C raised by the petitioner clearly established on record that the petitioner was working as Supervisor and not as workman. From the statement of claim as available on record, the petitioner has failed to make any averment that he was doing any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational and clerical work. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the evidence as available on record it can be concluded that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Therefore, keeping in view the evidence as available on record there is no hesitation in the mind of the Court to come to the conclusion that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Accordingly, issue no.3 is answered in favour of the respondent and against the petitioner.

ISSUES No. 1 & 2.

24. Being interlinked and co-related both these issues are taken up together. Keeping in view my findings on issue no. 3 above, both these issues become redundant.

RELIEF

25. As a Sequel to my above discussion and findings on issues no. 1 to 3, the claim filed by the petitioner fails and is hereby dismissed being not maintainable. Consequently, the present reference is answered in negative by holding that since the petitioner is not a workman, he is not entitled to any relief from this Court.

26. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication as per law. File be consigned to the record room after necessary compliance by Ahlmad.

Announced in the open Court today on this 8th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE,
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-**LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**.

Reference Number : 20 of 2022.

Instituted on : 14-01-2022

Decided on : 08-12-2025

Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, HP. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, HP. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Shri Rahul Singh, Advocate.

For the Respondent : Sh. Rajeev Sharma, Advocate.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether termination of the services of Shri Gian Chand, s/o Shri Mohan, Village Chamukha, P.O. Sehli (Harabagh), Tehsil Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, HP by the Managing Director, M/S Medicef Pharma, Plot No. 28, Phase-1, Village Jharmajri, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, HP w.e.f. 31-10-2018 without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If not, what relief including reinstatement of the services, seniority, amount of back-wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management/employer?"

2. The case of the petitioner, as it emerges from the statement of claim is that he is a workman as defined under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred as the Act). He was engaged as store supervisor in Storage Department of the respondent company *w.e.f.* 20-05-2011 and had worked as such till 14-06-2018. Neither increments in parity with other workers have been given to him nor he was promoted.

Workmen junior to him were getting periodic increments and their salaries/wages were also on higher side. As the petitioner while doing his duty had found discrepancies in the entries of detail of stock and had reported the same to the Head of Factory through e-mails, the Maintenance Manager, Purchase Manager and official of the HR Department got annoyed and had hatched a conspiracy to harass him financially, mentally and physically. Even, his wages and monetary benefits were reduced and he was not granted leave during the pregnancy of his wife, who as such could not get proper medical care. On account of continuous harassment, he had made complaints to various authorities through e-mail. He was, however, threatened by the Plant Head, which forced him to make another complaint on 27-10-2017, through e-mail. Upon mediation by the owner of the company, the matter was resolved and he had withdrawn his complaint. He had written to the respondent to grant him promotion, increments, monetary benefits and salary at par with other co-workers of his stature, but the Plant Head had put his remarks that the same be considered in March, 2018, so he sent a reminder, but to no avail. The respondent and its officials had issued false explanations dated 21-04-2018 and 23-04-2018, which were duly replied by him through e-mail. His wife had received a letter dated 27-04-2018, who after reading it got tensed, which led to her miscarriage. He then made a complaint through e-mail on 17-05-2018. Again a frivolous explanation letter was issued to him on 19-05-2018. He responded to it on 21-05-2018. He was wrongly suspended vide letter dated 14-06-2018, without any charge-sheet. False allegations were levelled against him *vide* charge-sheet dated 04-07-2018. He had replied to the suspension order and the charge-sheet, in detail, but it was not considered by the respondent company. An enquiry was conducted against him but he was not allowed to participate in the same. He was made to sit in the reception room and his mobile phone and documentary record brought by him was tried to be snatched from him by the officials of the company. His services were terminated on the day, on which the reference was sent, so the same is illegal, being during the pendency of the conciliation proceedings. By leveling charges, he was pressurized to withdraw his rightful demand regarding his promotion, increments, work condition etc. He raised an industrial dispute, which led to the present reference. The claim is duly supported with the affidavit of petitioner.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent and in pursuance thereof the petition was contested by the respondent by filing reply wherein the respondent took preliminary objections regarding lack of maintainability, concealment of material facts, the petitioner is not a workman as he was appointed as a supervisor and that the reference is not a legal one. By asserting an additional plea, the respondent has contended that during the course of his employment, the petitioner had indulged in grave misconduct, hence an independent, fair and impartial enquiry into the misconduct was got conducted by an independent person. The enquiry officer conducted the enquiry as per the principles of the natural justice by affording full opportunity to attend the same, but the petitioner had failed to attend the enquiry proceedings on trifle matters and as such the enquiry officer had proceeded him ex-parte. The petitioner is stated to be gainfully employed and earning more than the amount which he was earning from the respondent. On merits, it is admitted that the petitioner was appointed on the post of Supervisor (Engineering Store) on 02-04-2012 at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/-. It was enhanced from time to time and at the time of his dismissal the petitioner was being paid Rs. 19,500/- per month. The duties assigned to him were purely supervisory in nature, hence the provisions of the Act are not attracted in this case. The petitioner had been insisting to be promoted as Manager/ Assistant Manager (Engineering Store), but the respondent refused as there was no post of Manager Engineering Store. It is denied that the salary of the petitioner was on the lower side. It is admitted that the suspension order and charge-sheet were served upon the petitioner. A Civil Suit for recovery of damages for wrongful termination in the Court of Senior Civil Judge, Sunder Nagar, District Mandi, HP has been filed by the petitioner against the respondent, on the same cause of action. After adopting the legal recourse, his services were rightly dismissed by the respondent. By denying the other allegations, the respondent has prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

4. While filing the rejoinder, the petitioner controverted the averments made in the reply and reiterated those in the statement of claim.

5. Out of the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were settled for determination and adjudication by this Court, *vide* order dated 30-09-2022:—

1. Whether the termination of the services of the petitioner by the respondent management *w.e.f.* 31.10.2018, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified? If yes, what relief the petitioner is entitled to? ..*OPP.*

2. Whether the service of the petitioner has been terminated by conducting domestic enquiry by the respondent witness in fair and proper manner as alleged? ..*OPP.*

3. Whether the claim petition is neither competent nor maintainable in the present form, as alleged? ..*OPR.*

4. Relief:

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. Besides having heard the Ld. Counsel for the parties, I have also gone through the record of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues, my findings thereon are as under:—

Issue No. 1	: Redundant.
Issue No. 2	: Redundant.
Issue No. 3	: Yes.
Relief	: Reference is answered in the Negative, as per operative part of the Award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUE NO. 3.

9. Issue no. 3 is taken up first for determination as the main contention of the respondent at the time of filing reply as well as addressing arguments is that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as defined under Section 2-S of the Act.

10. Per the respondent, the petitioner at the time of dismissal was drawing salary of Rs. 19,500/- per month and was primarily performing supervisory duties, as such does not fall within the preview of "workman", as contemplated under Section 2(s) of the Act. As per the respondent the petitioner was appointed initially on 02-04-2012 as supervisor (Engineering Store) at a monthly salary of Rs. 8,000/- and his salary was enhanced from time to time. Thus, per the respondent the present reference is not maintainable as the petitioner does not fall within the definition of the "workman".

11. The petitioner no doubt has admitted that he was engaged in the store department of the respondent company as supervisor, and he was engaged on 20-05-2011. As per the petitioner, he squarely falls within the definition of "workman".

12. Now, coming to the evidence which has been led by the petitioner to prove his case, he has appeared into the witness box as PW-1 and tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the claim petition. The petitioner has also tendered in evidence documents Mark PX-1 to Mark PX-19. During cross-examination, he admitted that the duties assigned to him were supervisory in nature. He also admitted that his last drawn salary was Rs. 19,500/- per month. He stated that he was allowed increment on lesser side and he was not promoted to the post of Manager despite having been promised by the respondent. He admitted that he has filed a civil suit in the Court of Civil Judge Sunder Nagar claiming damages of Rs. 40 lakhs for harassment to him and his family members.

13. The respondent on the other hand examined Shri Sanjay Jain as RW-1 who also tendered in evidence affidavit Ex. RW-1/A which is reproduction of averments as made in the reply. He also tendered in evidence appointment of enquiry officer Ex. R-1, report Ex. R-2, statement and complaints Ex. R-3, statement of witness/chargesheet Mark RX-1, suspension order Mark RX-2, appointment of enquiry officer dated 18.7.2018 Mark RX-3, appointment of MR Mark RX-4, second show cause notice Mark RX-5, dismissal letter Mark RX-6 and reply to conciliation officer Mark RX-7.

14. It, thus, emerges from the facts on record that the petitioner admittedly was appointed in the storage department of the respondent company as Supervisor store. It is also admitted that the last drawn salary of the petitioner was around Rs. 19,500/-. The petitioner has admitted that since he was working as supervisor in the store and was discharging the duties which were supervisory in nature.

15. Before adverting any further, it would be apposite to venture into the legal aspect of the matter, as to whether the petitioner would fall within the terms of Section 2(s) of the Act. The Section read and under:—

> "*Workman" means any person (including an apprentice employed in any industry to do any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational, clerical or supervisory work for hire or reward, whether the terms of employment be express or implied, and for the purposes of any proceeding under this Act in relation to an industrial dispute, includes any such person who has been dismissed, discharged or retrenched in connection with, or as a consequence of, that dispute, or whose dismissal, discharge or retrenchment has led to that dispute, but does not include any such person-*
>
> > *(i) who is subject to the Air Force Act, 1950 (45 of 1950), or the Army Act, 1950 (46 of 1950), or the Navy Act, 1957 (62 of 1957); or*
> >
> > *(ii) who is employed in the police service or as an officer or other employee of a prison; or*
> >
> > *(iii) who is employed mainly in a managerial or administrative capacity; or*
> >
> > *(iv) who, being employed in a supervisory capacity, draws wages exceeding one thousand six hundred rupees per mensem or exercises, either by the nature of the duties attached to the office or by reason of the powers vested in him, function mainly of a managerial nature.*

16. The definition itself stipulates as to who a workman would be. However, clauses-l to IV are the exceptions, which have been carved out to say that the following would not fall within the category of a "workman" (in our case clauses- III and IV is relevant to be noticed). The bare reading of the Section shows that a person who is employed in a managerial or administrative capacity would not fall within the term of

workman and the person who is employed in a supervisory capacity and draws wages exceeding Rs. 10,000/- per mensem and discharges functions mainly of a managerial or supervisory in nature would also not come within the purview of the term "workman".

17. Viewed in this context, the admissions made by the petitioner in his cross-examination shows that he had been assigned the duties which were primarily supervisory in nature and that his last drawn salary was Rs. 19,500/-. No doubt, the work or the job profile of the petitioner has not been brought on record by the respondent, but it is by now well settled that the admissions are the best piece of evidence. The admissions made by the petitioner, as discussed aforesaid would go to show that he was employed in the supervisory capacity and had been drawing wages exceeding Rs. 10,000/- mensem and that he had been assigned duties of supervisory nature.

18. Though, in determining the nature of work, the designation of the employee or the name assigned to him should not be given due importance. The primary duty performed by the person is to be given due importance but coming to the case in hand there is no evidence worth the name to suggest that the petitioner was doing any other duties except to supervise the work in the respondent company**. In Somnath Tulshi Ram Galande Vs. Presiding Officer, IInd Labout Court Pune and others 2008 (4) Mh.L.J 163, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held as under:—**

> *"Where a particular workman is a supervisor within or without the definition of "workman" is "ultimately a question of fact, at best one of mixed fact and law" and "will really depend upon the nature of the industry, the type of work in which he is engaged, the organizational setup of the particular unit of industry and the like factors."*

19. The Hon'ble High Court had come to record a finding in the aforesaid case that the appellant therein was undertaking supervisory and managerial work as such he was not covered under the definition of "workman".

20. Similarly, in **S.K. Maini v. Carona Sahu Co. Ltd., 1994 AIR 1824,** the Supreme Court has held as under:—

> *"After giving our careful consideration to the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the parties, it appears to us that whether or not an employee is a workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act is required to be determined with reference to his principal nature of duties and functions. Such question is required to be determined with reference to the facts and circumstances of the case and materials on record and it is not possible to lay down any straitjacket formula which can decide the dispute as to the real nature of duties and functions being performed by an employee in all cases. When an employee is employed to do the types of work enumerated in the definition of workman under Section 2(s), there is hardly any difficulty in treating him as a workman under the appropriate classification but in the complexity of industrial or commercial organizations quite a large number of employees are often required to do more than one kind of work. In such cases, it becomes necessary to determine under which classification the employee will fall for the purpose of deciding whether he comes within the definition of workman or goes out of it ...the designation of an employee is not of much importance and what is important is the nature of duties being performed by the employee. The determinative factor is the main duties of the employee concerned and not some works incidentally done. In other words, what is, in substance, the work which employee does or what in substance he is employed to do. Viewed from this*

angle, if the employee is mainly doing supervisory work but incidentally or for a fraction of time also does some manual or clerical work, the employee should be held to be doing supervisory works. Conversely, if the main work is of manual, clerical or of technical nature, the mere fact that some supervisory or other work is also done by the employee incidentally or only a small fraction of working time is devoted to some supervisory works, the employee will come within the purview of 'workman' as Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

The appellant in the present case had multifarious duties and most of his duties were supervisory and managerial. He had the power and capacity to take decisions, supervise work of others and was also responsible for quality control of the products being manufactured. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the documentary and oral evidence led by the parties, it can be concluded that the appellant was not a 'workman' within the definition of Section 2(s) of the Act. Looking into the admission of the workman and specific language of Exhibit 29 and the terms and conditions of his appointment, it is difficult to arrive at any conclusion other than the one arrived at by the Labour Court and the learned single Judge in the impugned order."

21. From the statement of claim as available on record, the petitioner has failed to make any averment that he was doing any manual, unskilled, skilled, technical, operational and clerical work. The character and nature of his duties while seen in the light of the evidence as available on record it can be concluded that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Coming to the case in hand from the statement of claim and evidence as available on record there is no hesitation in the mind of the Court to come to the conclusion that the petitioner does not fall under the definition of "workman" as provided under Section 2(s) of the Act. Accordingly, issue no.3 is answered in favour of the respondent and against the petitioner.

ISSUES No. 1 & 2.

22. Keeping in view my findings on issue no. 3 above, both these issues have become redundant and answered accordingly.

RELIEF

23. As a Sequel to my above discussion and findings on issues no. 1 to 3, the claim filed by the petitioner fails and is hereby dismissed being not maintainable. Consequently, the present reference is answered in negative by holding that since the petitioner is not a workman, he is not entitled to any relief from this Court.

24. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate Government for publication as per law. File be consigned to the record room after necessary compliance by Ahlmad.

Announced in the open Court today on this 8th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-**LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**.

Reference Number : 41 of 2025

Instituted on : 29-05-2025

Decided on : 09-12-2025

1. Pankaj Kumar, s/o Sh. Milap Chand, r/o Dagoh Khas, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, H.P.

2. Narender Singh, s/o Sh. Anoop Singh, Village Kathana, P.O. Surla, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P.

3. Jagga Singh, s/o Sh. Karan Singh, r/o Mahtoli, P.O. Diala, Ward No. 3, Dhiala Kangra, H.P.

4. Vijay Rawat, r/o Village Jyundhasli, P.O. Palio, District Gharwal, Uttrakhand.

5. Pawan Kumar, Village Chand Sauli, District Ambala, HR.

6. Ravinder Kumar, s/o Sh. Balwant Ram, V.P.O. Sarawan, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamunagar, HR.

7. Bhupender Pal, s/o Sh. Dev Raj, Village Gheru Balh, P.O. Turnoh, District Mandi, H.P. ..*Petitioner's.*

VERSUS

The Factory Manager, M/S Rich Products and Solutions Pvt. Ltd., Village Ogli, Nahan Road, Kala-Amb, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

For the Petitioner's : Nemo

For the Respondent : Sh. Rahul Mahajan, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether the demand raised vide demand notice (copy enclosed) by (i) Sh. Pankaj Kumar, s/o Sh. Milap Chand, r/o Dagoh Khas, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, H.P. (ii) Sh. Narender Singh, s/o Sh. Anoop Singh, Village Kathana, P.O. Surla, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmour, H.P. (iii) Sh. Jagga Singh, s/o Sh. Karan Singh, r/o Mahtoli, P.O. Diala, Ward No. 3, Dhiala Kangra, H.P. (iv) Sh. Vijay Rawat, r/o Village Jyundhasli, P.O. Palio, District Gharwal, Uttrakhand. (V) Sh. Pawan Kumar, Village Chand Sauli, District Ambala, HR. (vi) Sh. Ravinder Kumar, s/o Sh. Balwant Ram, VPO Sarawan, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamunagar, HR. (vii) Sh. Bhupender Pal, s/o Sh. Dev Raj, Village Gheru Balh, P.O. Turnoh, District Mandi, H.P. to be fulfilled by Factory Manager M/S Rich Products and Solutions Pvt. Ltd., Village Ogli, Nahan Road, Kala Amb, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur,

H.P. are proper and justified? If yes, to what monetary and other consequential service benefits, the above mentioned workmen are entitled to from the above said Employer?"

2. The case was listed for filing of statement of claim of the parties but, neither the petitioner's nor their counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workmen/petitioners had remained *ex-parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workmen is present, they are unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue their case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workmen nor their counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioners to plead and prove on record that the demand raised by (i) Sh. Pankaj Kumar, s/o Sh. Milap Chand, r/o Dagoh Khas, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra, H.P. (ii) Sh. Narender Singh, s/o Sh. Anoop Singh, Village Kathana, P.O. Surla, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. (iii) Sh. Jagga Singh, s/o Sh. Karan Singh, r/o Mahtoli, P.O. Diala, Ward No. 3, Dhiala Kangra, H.P. (iv) Sh. Vijay Rawat, r/o Village Jyundhasli, P.O. Palio, District Gharwal, Uttrakhand. (V) Sh. Pawan Kumar, Village Chand Sauli, District Ambala, HR. (vi) Sh. Ravinder Kumar, s/o Sh. Balwant Ram, VPO Sarawan, Tehsil Bilaspur, District Yamunagar, HR. (vii) Sh. Bhupender Pal, s/o Sh. Dev Raj, Village Gheru Balh, P.O. Turnoh, District Mandi, H.P. to be fulfilled by Factory Manager M/S Rich Products and Solutions Pvt. Ltd., Village Ogli, Nahan Road, Kala Amb, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. are unjustified, however, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioners/ workmen. Since, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioners that they are entitled to any benefits and relief as claimed in demand from the respondent management, it cannot be held that the demand raised by the petitioners are genuine and justified. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioners/workmen have not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioners are not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 9th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number : 143 of 2025

Instituted on : 18-08-2025

Decided on : 12-12-2025

Rajeshwari, w/o Sh. Soran, c/o Satish Kumar, President Distt. Solan, H.P. A.I.T.U.C., H.Q #7, Omaxe Parkwoods Phase-II, Chakkan Road, Baddi, District Solan, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

1. The Managing Director, M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205.

2. M/S KDR Associates (Contractor) C/O M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd. Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205. ..*Respondents.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent no. 1 : Sh. Prateek Kumar, Adv.

For the Respondent no. 2 : Nemo

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether the termination of the services of Smt. Rajeshwari w/o Sh. Soran, c/o Satish Kumar, President Distt. Solan, H.P. A.I.T.U.C., H.Q #7, Omaxe Parkwoods Phase-II, Chakkan Road, Baddi, District Solan, H.P. by (i) the Managing Director, M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205 (Principal Employer) (ii) M/S KDR Associates (Contractor) C/O M/S Charak Pharma Pvt. Ltd., Khasra No. 186/1, 139/3, Village Katha, Tehsil Baddi, District Solan, H.P. 173205 w.e.f. 01.03.2024, without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged, by the workman, is legal and justified? If not, what relief of reinstatement, seniority, amount of back wages, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above managements?"

2. The case was listed for appearance of the parties for today but, however, neither the petitioner as well as respondent no. 2 nor their counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/ petitioner had remained *ex-parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:-

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.— If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, she is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue her case.

8. In the instant case, neither the parties nor any counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that the termination of her services *w.e.f.* 01-03-2024 was without complying with the provisions of the Act and, thus, illegal and unjustified. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 12th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

Sanjay Thakur v/s MMU Solan

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13.12.2025.

13.12.2025 Present:- Sh. Deepak Kumar, Advocate Vice Csl. for the petitioner.

None for respondent.

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *vide* notification no. 11- 2/93 (Lab)ID/2019/Solan-Sanjay, dated 30-04-2019 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 83 of 2019 titled as Sanjay Thakur Vs. MMU Solan, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lok Adalat held on 29-11-2025. The petitioner has stated that the respondent has agreed to re-engage him with seniority and continuity. The respondent has also agreed to pay back-wages *w.e.f.* 12-06-2018 to 15-12-2025 @ 25% of last drawn wages on or before 15-01-2026. Now nothing survive in the present reference. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Ajay Singal, Registrar of respondent college has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct and now nothing survive in the present reference petition. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) of both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after comp be consigned to record room.

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat

Announced: 13.12.2025. App. 54/2019

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13.12.2025.

13.12.2025 Present:- Sh. Deepak, Advocate vice Csl. for petitioner.

None for the respondent.

With the due divulgence of National Lok Adalat and with the intervention of this Court, the matter i.e the claim petition filed under Section 2-A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 registered as Application No. 54 of 2019 titled as Deepan Vs. Registrar, Maharishi Markandeshwar Medical College, Solan, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lok Adalat held on 08-12-2025. The Ld. Counsel for the petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent University as the respondent has agreed to pay an amount of Rs. 3,50,000/- (Rs. Three lakhs Fifty only) to him on or before 15-01-2026. Now, there is no dispute with the respondent arising out of this application and the application be decided accordingly. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Ajay Singhal, Registrar of respondent University has admitted the aforesaid statement of Ld. Counsel for the petitioner to be correct and agreed to pay the settled

amount on or before 15-01-2026 failing which the petitioner shall be entitled for interest @ 12% per annum. Now, nothing survive in the present application.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National LokAdalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/application. The respondent is directed to pay the agreed settlement amount of Rs. 3,50,000/- to the petitioner on or before 15.01.2026 failing which the petitioner is held entitled for interest @ 12% per annum from the date of order.The statement(s) of learned counsel for the respondent as well as petitioner shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for Publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13.12.2025

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member.	Member	Chairman, National LokAdalat.

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13.12.2025.

Dhyan Singh V/s MMU, Solan. Ref. 151/2025

13.12.2025 Present : None.

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *vide* notification no. 11- 2/93 (Lab)ID/2025/Solan, dated 30-08-2025 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 151 of 2025 titled as Dhyan Singh Vs. The Registrar MMU Solan, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lokAdalat held on 11-12-2025. The AR for the petitioner has stated that the petitioner has compromised the dispute with the respondent as the respondent has paid an amount of Rs. 90,000/- (Rs. Ninty Thousand only) as full and final amount of claim arising out of reference no. 151 of 2025 and now the petitioner has no claim against the respondent and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record. Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statement, this National LokAdalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the petitioner has settled the dispute amicably. Since, the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement of petitioner shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13-12-2025.

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member.	Member	Chairman, National LokAdalat

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13.12.2025

Manoj Sharma Vs. M/s JHS Ltd. Ref. 147/2024

13-12-2025 Present: Petitioner in person.

Sh. Amrish Kumar, Senior Executive of respondent.

With the due divulgence of National LokAdalat 11- and with the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *vide* notification no. 11-1/86(Lab)ID/2024/Nahan, dated 04-11-2024 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 147 of 2024 titled as Manoj Sharma Vs. Occupier/Factory Manager M/s JHS Ltd., stood amicably resolved between the parties. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company and has received an amount of Rs. 90,000/- through Cheque No. 632 from the respondent company as full and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 147 of 2024 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Amrish Kumar, Senior Executive of respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since, the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13-12-2025.

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member.	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

Sh. Deepak Kaushal Vs. M/s Microtek Himachal Power Products. Ref. 75/2020

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13.12.2025.

13-12-2025 Present: None. for the petitioner.

Sh. Sandeep Sharma, Manager (Legal) for the respondent.

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e*. the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *vide* notification no. 11- 2/93(Lab)ID/2020/Solan-Deepak, dated 02.06.2020 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 75 of 2020 titled as Deepak Kaushal Vs. M/s Microtek Himachal Power Products, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lok Adalat held on 06.11.2025. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company and has received an amount of Rs. 36,000/- through Cheque No. 1690 from the respondent company as full

and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 75 of 2020 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Sandeep Sharma, Manager (Legal) of respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since, the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13-12-2025.

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member.	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

Sh. Bhim Yadav v/s M/s Microtek Universal Power Products. Ref. 152/2024

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13.12.2025.

13-12-2025 Present: Petitioner with Ms. Heena Chauhan, Ld. Csl. for the petitioner.

Sh. Sandeep Sharma, Manager (Legal) for the respondent.

With the due divulgence of National Lok Adalat and with the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e.* the reference received from the appropriate Government under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *vide* 2/93 (Lab)ID/2024/Solan, dated 02-12-2024 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 152 of 2024 titled as Bhim Yadav Vs. The Factory Manager, M/s Microtek Universal Power Products, stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lok Adalat held on 10-12-2025. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company as the respondent company has agreed to pay an amount of Rs. 2,60,000/- (Rs. Two Lakhs Sixty Thousand only) within a period of ten days as full and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 152 of 2024 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Sandeep Sharma, Head Legal of respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Today, also the petitioner *vide* his separate statement has further stated that he has received an amount of Rs. 2,60,000 through cheque No. 000018 from the respondent today before National Lok Adalat.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement, therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) of both the parties shall form part and parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13-12-2025.

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member.	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

Sh. Naresh Bharti V/s M/s Delhivery Ltd. Ref. 24/2023

BEFORE NATIONAL LOK ADALAT HELD ON 13-12-2025.

13-12-2025 Present: None.

With the intervention of this Court, the matter *i.e.* the referecne received from the appropriate Governemnt under Section 10 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 *vide* notification no. 11- 6/85(Lab)ID/2022/Shimla-Naresh, dated 29-11-2022 for adjudication, which was registered as reference no. 24 of 2023 titled as Naresh Bharti Vs. M/s Delhivery Ltd., stood amicably resolved between the parties during pre lok Adalat held on 26-11-2025. The petitioner has stated that he has compromised the dispute with the respondent company and has received an amount of Rs. 40,000/- through demand draft No. 444529 from the respondent company as full and final amount of his claim arising out of reference no. 24 of 2023 and now he has no claim against the respondent company and nothing survive in the present reference petition. To this effect his statement recorded separately and placed on record.

Vide separate statement Shri Kulvir Thakur, Advocate for respondent company has admitted the aforesaid statement of petitioner to be correct on behalf of respondent company.

Therefore, in view of the aforesaid statements, this National Lok Adalat has no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the parties have settled the dispute amicably. Since the matter stood amicably settled between the parties, by way of amicable settlement therefore, nothing survive in this claim/ reference. The present reference is answered accordingly. The statement(s) of learned counsel for the respondent as well as petitioner shall form part a parcel of this award.

Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to record room.

Announced: 13-12-2025

(Veena Kashyap)	(Shailee Thakur)	(Anuja Sood)
Member.	Member	Chairman, National Lok Adalat.

23.12.2025 Present: Sh. Anil Thakur, Ld. Csl. for the petitioner.

(PoA has been filed. It be taken on record)

Notice issued to the respondent, but none has appeared on behalf of him.

However, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has made a statement without oath that the petitioner has compromise the matter with the respondent outside of the Court and he is not interested to proceeded further with this matter. Since, parties have effected the compromise out- side the Court and petitioner is neither interested to proceeded further this reference and the same is disposed off. The reference received from the appropriate government is answered accordingly. The statement of the learned counsel for the petitioner shall form part and parcel of this award. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate government for its publication in the official gazette. File, after competing be consigned to records.

Announced: 23.12.2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court, Shimla, H.P.
Camp Court at Nahan.

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE
HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference Number	: 59 of 2024
Instituted on	: 24-07-2024
Decided on	: 30-12-2025

Rajmal Thakur, s/o Sh. Birbal Ram Thakur, c/o J.C. Bhardwaj, President HP AITUC, HQ: Saproon District Solan, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Managing Director, M/s Exicom Tele-Systems Ltd., 8 Electronics Complex Chambaghat, Tehsil & District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner	: Nemo
For the Respondent	: Ms. Vandana, Advocate.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether Sh. Rajmal Thakur, s/o Sh. Birbal Ram Thakur, r/o Village Hiun. P.O. Nalyana, Tehsil Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P., who was initially engaged as Senior Technician

Assistant and subsequently by virtue of seniority/ promotion working as Engineer at the time of termination of services, falls under the definition of 'workman' u/s 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? If yes, what relief, Sh. Rajmal Thakur is entitled to? And if not, what it's legal effect?"

Whether the demand of Sh. Rajmal Thakur, s/o Sh. Birbal Ram Thakur, r/o Village Hiun, P.O. Nalyana, Tehsil Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P., for his reinstatement in service before the Managing Director, M/s Exicom Tele-Systems Ltd. 8 Electronics Complex Chambaghat, Tehsil & District Solan, H.P., is proper and justified? If yes, what relief the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above management?" and If not, its effect?"

2. The case was listed for appearance of the parties for today but, however, neither the petitioner nor his counsel had put in appearance before this Tribunal, despite the case being called several times since morning. Hence, despite due notice of the date of hearing, the workman/petitioner had remained *ex parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to file the statement of claim, adduce evidence or argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that he falls under the definition of the workman under Section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act and further that he is entitled for reinstatement in service. However, there is neither any pleading nor any evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman had not put in appearance before this Tribunal. In this view of the matter, the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 30th day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, H.P.

BEFORE ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-**LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**.

Reference Number : 198 of 2021

Instituted on : 27-10-2021

Decided on : 31-12-2025

Janav Kumar, s/o Sh. Kali Dass, r/o Village Khanewali, P.O. Dev Nagar, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla, H.P. ..*Petitioner.*

VERSUS

The Factory Manager, M/s Sweet Industries India Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 17, Sector-1 Parwanoo, Tehsil Kasauli, District Solan, H.P. ..*Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the Petitioner : Nemo

For the Respondent : Sh. Prateek Kumar, Adv.

AWARD

The reference given below has been received from the appropriate Government for adjudication:—

"Whether non-payment of full and final (which includes bonus, leave encashment and gratuity) to the workman Sh. Janav Kumar, s/o Sh. Kali Dass, r/o Village Khanewali, P.O. Dev Nagar, Tehsil Rampur, District Shimla, H.P. by the Management of M/S Sweet Industries India Pvt. Ltd., Plot No. 17, Sector-1 Parwanoo, Tehsil Kasauli, District Solan, H.P. on account of his resignation after serving one month notice to the management, is legal and justified? If not, what benefits the above workman is entitled to?"

2. The case was listed for the evidence of the petitioner for today, the petitioner has still not turned up, neither anyone else has appeared on his behalf, nor any witness is present nor any steps have been taken. This was the last opportunity granted to the petitioner for evidence but despite that neither the petitioner nor any evidence is present today in the Court. As such, workman/petitioner has remained *ex-parte.*

3. It will be apt at this stage to take note of the relevant provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act' for brevity sake). Section 2 (b) of the Act defines the Award as under:—

"(b) "award" means an interim or a final determination of any industrial dispute or of any question relating thereto by any Labour Court, Industrial Tribunal or National Industrial Tribunal and includes an arbitration award made under Section 10A;".

4. Sub-Section (1) of Section 11 of the Act provides that subject to any rules that may be made in this behalf, an arbitrator, a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal shall follow such procedure as the arbitrator or other authority concerned may think it fit. The Central Government has framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957." Rule 10-B (9) reads thus:—

"10-B (9) In case any party defaults or fails to appear at any stage the Labour Court, Tribunal, or National Tribunal, as the case may be, may proceed with the reference ex-parte and decide the reference application in the absence of the defaulting party."

5. Rule 22 reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

6. The State of Himachal Pradesh has also framed rules called "The Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974." Rule 25 thereof reads thus:—

"Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed ex-parte.- If without sufficient cause being shown, any party to the proceeding before a Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator fails to attend or to be represented, the Board, Court, Labour Court, Tribunal, National Tribunal or Arbitrator may proceed, as if the party had duly attended or had been represented."

7. Rule 22 of the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1957 and Rule 25 of the Industrial Disputes Rules, 1974 authorize the adjudicating authority to proceed in the absence of a party. It creates a fiction which enables the Tribunal to presume that all the parties are present before it although, infact, it is not true, and thus make an *ex-parte* award. This Tribunal in these circumstances has to imagine that the absentee workman is present and having done so, can give full effect to its imagination and carry it to its logical end. Under Rule 25, this Tribunal, thus, has to imagine that the workman is present, he is unwilling to lead any evidence in support of statement of claim and to argue his case.

8. In the instant case, neither the workman nor his counsel has put in appearance before this Tribunal today. In these circumstances, the Tribunal can proceed and pass *ex-parte* award on its merits.

9. As per the reference, it was required of the petitioner to plead and prove on record that non-payment of full and final (which includes bonus, leave encashment and gratuity) to the petitioner by the management of respondent on account of his resignation after serving one month notice to the management, is legal and justified. However, there is no evidence to this effect on record on the part of the petitioner/workman. At the risk of repetition, it is reiterated that the petitioner/workman has not put in appearance before this Tribunal as such the petitioner is not entitled to any relief. Accordingly, this reference is answered in the negative. Parties to bear their own costs.

10. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

11. A copy of this Award be sent to the appropriate Government for necessary action at its end and the file after due completion be consigned to the Record Room.

Announced in the open Court today this 31st day of December, 2025.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Labour Court-cum-*Industrial Tribunal ,*
Shimla, (H.P.).

In the Court of Tehsildar-cum-Executive Magistrate, Dhatwal at Bijhari, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :—

Pushpa Devi

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice to General Public.

Pushpa Devi d/o Kapoora Ram, r/o Village & P.O. Sathwin, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has applied in this office for the entry of her birth event which has taken place on 03-03-1953, but due to ignorance it could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Sathwin. In this regard, the applicant Pushpa Devi has submitted the requisite documents mentioning her date of birth *i.e*. 03-03-1953.

General public is hereby informed through this notice that if anyone has any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant Pushpa Devi *i.e.* 03-03-1953, they can either in person or through counsel file their objections before the undersigned within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice, otherwise the matter shall be proceeded further accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 14-01-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Tehsildar-cum**-Executive Magistrate, Dhatwal at Bijhari, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :—

Shakuntla Devi

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice to General Public.

Shakuntla Devi d/o Bishan Singh, r/o Village Baragram, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has applied in this office for the entry of her date of birth event which took place on 28-10-1954, but due to ignorance it could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Dhabiri. In this regard, the applicant Shakuntla Devi has submitted the requisite documents mentioning his date of birth *i.e*. 28-10-1954.

General public is hereby informed through this notice that if anyone has any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant *i.e.* 28-10-1954, they can either in person or through counsel file their objections before the undersigned within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice, otherwise the matter shall be proceeded further accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 29-01-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Tehsildar-cum-**Executive Magistrate, Dhatwal at Bijhari,**
Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :—

Vanita Kumari *alias* Tulsi Devi

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice to General Public.

Vanita Kumari *alias* Tulsi Devi d/o Dullu Ram, r/o Village Tang, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has applied in this office for the entry of her date of birth event which took place on 05-05-1968, but due to ignorance it could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Dhangota. In this regard, the applicant Vanita Devi *alias* Tulsi Devi has submitted the requisite documents mentioning her date of birth *i.e*. 05-05-1968.

General public is hereby informed through this notice that if anyone has any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant *i.e.* 05-05-1968, they can either in person or through counsel file their objections before the undersigned within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice, otherwise the matter shall be proceeded further accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 29-01-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Tehsildar-cum-**Executive Magistrate, Dhatwal at Bijhari,**
Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :—

Desh Raj

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice to General Public.

Desh Raj s/o Prabhu Ram, r/o Village Kchhwin, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has applied in this office for the entry of his date of birth event which took place on 04-01-1963, but due to ignorance it could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Dandwin. In this regard, the applicant Desh Raj has submitted the requisite documents mentioning his date of birth as 04-01-1963.

General public is hereby informed through this notice that if anyone has any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant *i.e.* 04-01-1963, they can either in person or through counsel file their objections before the undersigned within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice, otherwise the matter shall be proceeded further accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 29-01-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Tehsildar-cum**-Executive Magistrate, Dhatwal at Bijhari, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :—

Chhonki Ram

Versus

General Public

Subject.— Notice to General Public.

Chhonki Ram s/o Chaudhary Ram, r/o Village Gharyani Jattan, Tehsil Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has applied in this office for the entry of his date of birth event which took place on 20-03-1963, but due to ignorance it could not be entered in the record of Gram Panchayat Samailla. In this regard, the applicant Chhonki Ram has submitted the requisite documents mentioning his date of birth as 20-03-1963.

General public is hereby informed through this notice that if anyone has any objection regarding the entry of date of birth of the applicant *i.e.* 20-03-1963, they can either in person or through counsel file their objections before the undersigned within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice, otherwise the matter shall be proceeded further accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on 29-01-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Dhatwal at Bijhari, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 : 80 / 25 किस्म मुकद्दमा : तकसीम

राजो देवी बनाम सुरिंदर कुमार आदि ..वादीगण।

1. राजो देवी पत्नी श्री अंगत पुत्र, 2. अजीत कुमार पुत्र अंगत, 3. किरणा देवी पुत्री अंगत, 4. परी पुत्री अंगत, टीका घरसाहड, मौजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0 ।

बनाम

1. सुरेंदर कुमार पुत्र हरसुख, 2. विजय कुमार पुत्र हर सुख, टीका घरसाहड, मौजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0 ..... प्रतिवादीगण ।

विषय.—प्रार्थना पत्र भू—राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की जेर धारा 123 के अंतर्गत भूमि खेवट नं0 454, खतौनी नं0 522, खसरा नं0 2008 / 1593, रकबा वकदर 0 कनाल 08 मरले जमाबंदी साल 2018—19, टीका घरसाहड मौजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0 के भूमि विभाजन हेतु प्रार्थना—पत्र ।

वादीगण ने खेवट नं0 454, खतौनी नं0. 522, खसरा नं0 2008 / 1593, रकबा वकदर 0 कनाल 08 मरले जमाबंदी साल 2018—19, टीका घरसाहड, मौजा मेवा, तहसील भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर, हि0प्र0 का दावा तकसीम हुक्मन दायर कर रखा है। जिसमें एक प्रतिवादी नं0. 2 श्री विजय कुमार पुत्र श्री हर सुख को साधारण तरीके से समन तामिल न हो पा रहे / हाजिर अदालत न हो पा रहे हैं। इसलिए तकसीम में सुने जाने में मौका के सिधांत को ध्यान में रखते हुए प्रतिवादी नं0 2 विजय कुमार को बजरिया राजपत्र इस्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह उक्त मुकद्दमा की पैरवी हेतु असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 11—02—26 को सुबह 11.00 बजे हाजिर होकर अपने केस की पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें। गैहाजिरी की सूरत में आपके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे व बाद तारीख पेशी किसी भी प्रकार का उजर या एतराज न होगा ।

आज दिनांक 25—01—2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / —
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
भोरंज, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

केस नम्बर : 70593—2026—ONLINE दायर तिथि : 07—01—2026 आगामी तारीख पेशी : 23—02—2026

श्री विकास पुत्र वेअंत उर्फ बलवंत सिंह, गांव व डाकघर टिहरा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम
आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना—पत्र बराए नाम दुरुस्ती अधीन धारा 37—38 हिमाचल प्रदेश भू—अधिनियम, 1954.

दिनांक 07—01—2026 को प्रार्थी श्री विकास पुत्र वेअंत उर्फ वलवंत सिंह, गांव व डाकघर, टिहरा तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) ने अपनी ओर से एक प्रार्थना—पत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश भू—अधिनियम 1954 की धारा 37—38 के अन्तर्गत प्रस्तुत कर के अनुरोध किया है कि उसका नाम उसके सभी दस्तावेजों में विकास राणा दर्ज है। जबकि राजस्व विभाग में उसका नाम विकास दर्ज है जोकि विकास राणा राजस्व विभाग में दर्ज / दुरुस्त किया जाये।

प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना—पत्र पर कार्यवाही करते हुए आरंभिक जांच व छानवीन फिल्ड स्टाफ के माध्यम से करवाई गई व स्थानीय टीकादारान के ब्यानात दर्ज करवाए गए जिसमें पाया गया कि प्रार्थी को सभी लोग विकास व विकास राणा दोनों नामों से जानते हैं।

इस बारे आम जनता को बजरिया इश्तहार / मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को राजस्व रिकार्ड में श्री विकास पुत्र वेअंत उर्फ वलवंत सिंह, गांव व डाकघर टिहरा, तहसील

सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) का नाम राजस्व विभाग में विकास की बजाय विकास राणा दर्ज / दुरुस्त किए जाने वारे कोई आपत्ति एवम् एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 23–02–2026 को सुबह 11.00 बजे इस अदालत मुकाम सुजानपुर में अपना उजर एवं एतराज पेश कर सकता है कोई आपत्ति एवम् एतराज प्राप्त न होने की सूरत में प्रार्थी उपरोक्त का नाम राजस्व रिकार्ड में विकास की बजाए विकास राणा दर्ज / दुरुस्त तस्दीक कर दिया जावेगा व इसके उपरांत कोई आपत्ति एवम् एतराज मान्य नहीं होगा।

यह इस्तहार / मुश्त्री मुनादी आज दिनांक 23–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ है।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
तहसीलदार एवम् सहायक समाहर्ता,
प्रथम श्रेणी सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)

केस नम्बर :	किस्म मुकद्दमा :	आगामी तारीख पेशी / सुनवाई :	दायर तिथि :
04 / 2026	इंद्राज जन्म तिथि	23–02–2026	22–01–2026

श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री शालो राम, निवासी गांव व डाकघर चमियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0) ..... प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता ..... प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री शालो राम, निवासी गांव व डाकघर चमियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) के सम्बन्ध में इश्तहार / सूचना / मुश्त्री मुनादी करवाने बारे।

श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री शालो राम, निवासी गांव व डाकघर चमियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) द्वारा आवेदन पत्र शपथ पत्र व अन्य सम्बंधित दस्तावेजों / रिकार्ड सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ है। जिसमें उल्लेख है कि श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री शालो राम, निवासी गांव व डाकघर चमियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) का जन्म दिनांक 03–04–1965 को हुआ है, जोकि अज्ञानतावश सम्बंधित ग्राम पंचायत चमियाणा के जन्म व मृत्यु रजिस्टर में आज दिन तक दर्ज नहीं हुआ है। अतः प्रार्थिया अपनी जन्म तिथि की घटना का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत चमियाणा के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस इश्तहार / मुश्त्री मुनादी द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त श्रीमती वीना देवी पुत्री शालो राम, निवासी गांव व डाकघर चमियाणा, तहसील सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) की जन्म तिथि 03–04–1965 की घटना का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत चमियाणा के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करवाने वारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 23–02–2026 को इस अदालत में प्रातः 11 बजे उपस्थित होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर उक्त जन्म तिथि 03–04–1965 की घटना का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत चमियाणा के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे तथा बाद में किसी भी प्रकार का कोई उजर मान्य नहीं होगा।

आज दिनाक 22–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं तहसीलदार,
सुजानपुर, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0 प्र0)।

———————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

किस्म मुकदमा : तकसीम केस नं0 : 7 / 25

अक्षय कुमार पुत्र श्री जैशी राम पुत्र माधो राम, निवासी गांव व डाकखाना गुलेर, मैजा गुलेर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 Through LD कौंसल कमलेश कुमार चौधरी।

बनाम

1. कुलबीर चंद पुत्र रीखी राम, 2. अंकुर सोनी पुत्र सुदर्शन सोनी, 3. विजय पुत्री बुट्टी सिंह उपनाम बुट्टी राम, 4. राज कुमारी पत्नी सुरेश कुमार, निवासी महाल उपरली दाड़ी, तहसील धर्मशाला, 5. साहिल जसवाल पुत्र संसार चंद, 6. राहिल जसवाल पुत्र संसार चंद, निवासी कोतवाली बाजार धर्मशाला, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0।

विषय.–– प्रार्थना–पत्र तकसीम भूमि खाता नं0 512, खतौनी नं0 761, खसरा नं0 917 व 927, कित्ता 2, रकबा तादादी 00–18–17, है0 वाकया महाल उपरली दाड़ी, मौजा खनियारा तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0 जमाबन्दी साल 2012–13

प्रार्थी अक्षय कुमार पुत्र श्री जैशी राम पुत्र माधो राम, निवासी गांव व डाकखाना गुलेर, मौजा गुलेर, तहसील व जिला कांगड़ा, हि0प्र0 Through LD कौंसल कमलेश कुमार चौधरी के माध्यम से प्रार्थना–पत्र तकसीम हुकमन बारे गुजारा है जिसमें उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को समन साधारण तरीके से तामील न हो पा रहे हैं। इसलिए उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को इश्तहार राजपत्र / मुस्त्री मुन्यादी के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी पक्ष को उपरोक्तवर्णित भूमि की तकसीम करने बारे कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में दिनांक 17–02–26 को प्रातः 11 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर अपने उजर या एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा हाजिर न आने कि सूरत में उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण के विरुद्ध एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी व तरीका तकसीम जारी कर दिया जाएगा।

आज दिनांक 16–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार,
धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

———————

In the Court of Executive Magistrate, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra (H.P.)

Sh. Manoj Chaudhary s/o Jeeto Ram, r/o V.P.O. Nagnpatt, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra (H.P.) Aadhar Card No. 8792 5471 6507.

Versus

The General Public

Sh. Manoj Chaudhary s/o Jeeto Ram, r/o V.P.O. Nagnpatt, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra (H.P.) Aadhar Card No. 8792 5471 6507 has submitted an application to undersigned for the correction of name of my son Pranav Choudhary as mentioned in his birth Certificate and old Aadhar Card No. 8834 5277 2957. That time of updating of Aadhar Card, the Aadhar card service provided has wrongly entered the name of my son as Aditi Kumari and date of birth of my son is wrongly entered as 06-06-2016.

That the name of my son is required to be corrected in Aadhar Card as Pranav Choudhary instead of Aditi Kumari as date of birth is required to be corrected as 04-06-2016. Therefore through this proclamation the general Public is hereby informed that any person having any objection in writing (30) thirty days from the date of publication of this notice in official Gezette. No objection will be entertained after prescribed period and application will be accordingly.

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this 28-01-2026.

Seal. Sd/-

Executive Magistrate,
Tehsil Dharamshala.

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 709620 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 24–02–2026

कशमीरी लाल पुत्र वेली राम, निवासी महाल रछाहण, डाकघर नहालियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––नाम दुरुस्ती।

प्रार्थी कशमीरी लाल पुत्र वेली राम, निवासी महाल रछाहण, डाकघर नहालियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने स्वयं उपस्थित होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती प्रस्तुत किया है कि पटवार वृत्त घुठियालता–1 के राजस्व महाल रछाहण, तहसील खुण्डियां के अभिलेख में गलती से उसके पिता का नाम वेलिया दर्ज हो गया है जबकि प्रार्थी के मृत्यु प्रमाण में पिता का नाम वेली राम दर्ज है, जोकि उसके पिता का सही नाम है। दो अलग–अलग नाम हो जाने के कारण प्रार्थी को दिक्कतों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। अतः प्रार्थी का आग्रह है कि उपरोक्तवर्णित महाल के राजस्व अभिलेख में उसके पिता का नाम वेली राम उपनाम वेलिया दर्ज किया जाये।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिये इश्तहार व मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती के सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 24–02–2026 को असालतन व वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर / एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी कशमीरी लाल पुत्र वेली राम, निवासी महाल रछाहण, डाकघर नहालियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के पिता का नाम राजस्व पटवार वृत्त घुठियालता–1 के राजस्व महाल रछाहण के राजस्व अभिलेख में वेली राम उपनाम वेलिया दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 28–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 709621 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 24–02–2026

जनक सिंह पुत्र वन्सी राम, निवासी महाल खरमूहण, डाकघर वारी कलां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––नाम दुरुस्ती।

प्रार्थी जनक सिंह पुत्र वन्सी राम, निवासी महाल खरमूहण, डाकघर वारी कलां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने स्वयं उपस्थित होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती प्रस्तुत किया है कि पटवार वृत्त धार के राजस्व महाल खरमूहण, तहसील खुण्डियां के अभिलेख में गलती से उसका नाम जनक चंद दर्ज हो गया है जबकि स्कूल के प्रमाण–पत्र, परिवार नकल में उसका नाम जनक सिंह दर्ज है, जोकि उसका सही नाम है। दो अलग–अलग नाम हो जाने के कारण प्रार्थी को दिक्कतों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। अतः प्रार्थी का आग्रह है कि उपरोक्त वर्णित महाल के राजस्व अभिलेख में उसका नाम जनक सिंह उपनाम जनक चन्द दर्ज किया जाये।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिये इश्तहार व मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती के सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 24–02–2026 को असालतन व वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर / एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी जनक सिंह पुत्र वन्सी राम, निवासी महाल खरमूहण, डाकघर वारी कलां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) का नाम राजस्व पटवार वृत्त धार के राजस्व महाल खरमूहण के राजस्व अभिलेख में जनक सिंह उपनाम जनक चन्द दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 29–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 709623 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 24–02–2026

कशमीर सिंह पुत्र पिंजा राम, निवासी महाल कराल, डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––नाम दुरुस्ती।

प्रार्थी कशमीर सिंह पुत्र पिंजा राम, निवासी महाल कराल, डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने स्वयं उपस्थित होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती प्रस्तुत किया है कि पटवार वृत्त अम्वाड़ा के राजस्व महाल कराल, महाल गहल, तहसील खुण्डियां के अभिलेख में गलती से उसके पिता का नाम पीहजा दर्ज हो गया है जबकि प्रार्थी के पिता के मृत्यु प्रमाण में पिता का नाम पिंजा राम दर्ज है, जोकि उसके पिता का सही नाम है। दो अलग–अलग नाम हो जाने के कारण प्रार्थी को दिक्कतों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। अतः प्रार्थी का आग्रह है कि उपरोक्तवर्णित महाल के राजस्व अभिलेख में उसके पिता का नाम पिंजा राम उपनाम पीहजा दर्ज किया जाये।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिये इश्तहार व मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती के सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 24–02–2026 को असालतन व वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर / एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी कशमीर सिंह पुत्र पिंजा राम, निवासी महाल कराल, डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के पिता का नाम राजस्व पटवार वृत्त अम्वाड़ा के राजस्व महाल कराल व महाल गहल के राजस्व अभिलेख में पिंजा राम उपनाम पीहजा दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 29–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)

केस नं0 : 709625 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 24–02–2026

प्रवीण राणा पुत्र वचित्र सिंह, निवासी महाल और डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––नाम दुरुस्ती।

प्रार्थी प्रवीण राणा पुत्र वचित्र सिंह, निवासी महाल और डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने स्वयं उपस्थित होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र नाम दुरुस्ती प्रस्तुत किया है कि पटवार वृत्त बड़ोगलाहड़ के राजस्व महाल और तहसील खुण्डियां के अभिलेख में गलती से उसके पिता का नाम जय चन्द दर्ज हो गया है जबकि प्रार्थी के पिता के मृत्यु प्रमाण–पत्र, पैन कार्ड़ में पिता का नाम विचित्र सिंह दर्ज है, जोकि

उसके पिता का सही नाम है। दो अलग–अलग नाम हो जाने के कारण प्रार्थी को दिक्कतों का सामना करना पड़ रहा है। अतः प्रार्थी का आग्रह है कि उपरोक्तवर्णित महाल के राजस्व अभिलेख में उसके पिता का नाम विचित्र सिंह उपनाम जय चन्द दर्ज किया जाये।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिये इश्तहार व मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस नाम दुरुस्ती के सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 24–02–2026 को असालतन व वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर / एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी प्रवीण राणा पुत्र वचित्र सिंह, निवासी महाल और डाकघर खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के पिता का नाम राजस्व पटवार वृत्त बड़ोगलाहड़ के राजस्व महाल मौर के राजस्व अभिलेख में विचित्र सिंह उपनाम जय चन्द दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 29–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 : 709624 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 24–02–2026

श्रीमती सकुंन्तला देवी पुत्री गुजर राम, निवासी गांव नरगोटा, डाकघर थिल, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण करने बारे।

श्रीमती सकुंन्तला देवी पुत्री गुजर राम, निवासी गांव नरगोटा, डाकघर थिल, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने स्वयं उपस्थित होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 01–07–1960 को हुआ है परन्तु गलती से ग्राम पंचायत वारी कलां के अभिलेख में उसकी जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हुई है जिसको ग्राम पंचायत वारी कलां के अभिलेख में दर्ज किया जाना अनिवार्य है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिया इश्तहार व मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 24–02–2026 को असालतन व वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर / एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा श्रीमती सकुंन्तला देवी पुत्री गुजर राम, निवासी गांव नरगोटा, डाकघर थिल, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की जन्म तिथि दिनांक 01–07–1960 जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत बारी कलां के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 29–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 : 709622 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 24–02–2026

श्रीमती सलोचना देवी पुत्री शुंका राम, निवासी गांव जसेहड, डाकघर सुरानी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण करने बारे।

श्रीमती सलोचना देवी पुत्री शुंका राम, निवासी गांव जसेहड, डाकघर सुरानी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने स्वयं उपस्थित होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 10–10–1968 को हुआ है परन्तु गलती से ग्राम पंचायत सुराणी के अभिलेख में उसकी जन्म तिथि दर्ज नहीं हुई है जिसको ग्राम पंचायत सुराणी के अभिलेख में दर्ज किया जाना अनिवार्य है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिया इश्तहार व मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 24–02–2026 को असालतन व वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर / एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा श्रीमती सलोचना देवी पुत्री शुंका राम, निवासी गांव जसेहड, डाकघर सुरानी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) की जन्म तिथि दिनांक 10–10–1968 जेरे धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत सुराणी के अभिलेख में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 29–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा तकसीम नं0 : 70968 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 03–03–2026

श्री अशोक कुमार पुत्र वचित्र सिंह, निवासी महाल भडोली, मौजा थिल व तहसील खुण्डिया, जिला कागड़ा हि0प्र0 ..प्रार्थी।

बनाम

1. श्री अनिल राणा पुत्र मंस्त राम आदि, निवासी महाल भडोली, मौजा थिल व तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0 .. प्रतिवादीगण।

नोटिस बनामः–

1 श्रीमती उर्मिला देवी पुत्री श्री वचित्र सिंह, निवासी महाल भडोली मौजा थिल व तहसील खुण्डियां जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0 .. प्रतिवादी।

विषय.––हि0प्र0 भू राजस्व अधिनियम 1954 की धारा 123 के अन्तर्गत भूमि खेवट नं0 07, खतौनी नं0 18, खसरा कित्ता 10, रकबा तादादी 00–59–74 है0 वाक्या महाल भडोली, मौजा थिल व तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0 के भूमि विभाजन हेतू प्रार्थना पत्र।

ईश्तहार अखबार व मुस्त्री मुनादी

श्री अशोक कुमार पुत्र वचित्र सिंह, निवासी महाल भडोली, मौजा थिल व तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में खाता नं0 07 महाल भडोली का दावा भूमि तकसीम दायर कर रखा है जिस में उपरोक्तवर्णित प्रतिवादी की तामील बार–बार समन जारी करने पर नहीं हो पा रही है और न ही प्रार्थी को इनका सही पता मालूम है। प्रार्थी ने इनका सही पता प्राप्त होने बारे अपनी असमर्थता जताई है। अतः न्यायालय की संतुष्टि व विश्वास हेतु यह सिद्ध हो गया है कि उक्त प्रतिवादी की तामील साधारण ढंग से नहीं हो सकती है।

अतः उक्तवर्णित प्रतिवादी को इस ईश्तहार–राजपत्र व मुस्त्री मुनादी, चस्पांगी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह उक्त मुकद्दमा की पैरवी हेतु असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेरी 03–03–2026 को हाजिर अदालत होकर पैरवी मुकदमा करें अन्यथा गैरहाजिरी की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिया जाएगा व बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर या ऐतराज स्वीकार्य न होगा ।

ये ईश्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 29–01–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
खुण्डियां जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––––

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, मझीण, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 : 81458 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 19–02–2026

श्री कुलदीप कुमार पुत्र राम दास, निवासी महाल तरयामलू, मौजा व उप–तहसील मझीण, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––नाम दुरुस्ती बाबत राजस्व अभिलेख।

प्रार्थी श्री कुलदीप कुमार पुत्र राम दास, निवासी महाल तरयामूल, मौजा व उप–तहसील मझीण, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रेषित अदालत कर निवेदन किया है कि उसके पिता का नाम पटवार वृत्त

मझीण के महाल तरयामलू, मौजा व उप–तहसील मझीण, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के राजस्व अभिलेख में राम सहाई पुत्र खजाना दर्ज है जबकि उसके पिता के अन्य दस्तावेजों, मेरे व मेरे भाई तथा माता–पिता (राम दास पुत्र खजाना की पत्नी) के दस्तावेजों में राम दास पुत्र खजाना दर्ज है। उसके पिता राम दास पुत्र खजाना की मत्यु दिनांक 21–07–1999 को हो चुकी है। अतः राजस्व अभिलेख के पटवार वृत्त मझीण के महाल तरयामलू में उसके पिता का नाम राम सहाई पुत्र खजाना की बजाए राम दास पुत्र खजाना दर्ज किया जाये। वास्तव में भिन्न–भिन्न दो नामों के वह एक ही व्यक्ति थे।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को सुनवाई हेतु बजरिया इश्तहार व इलाका मुश्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में किसी प्रकार का कोई भी उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 19–02–2026 प्रातः 11.00 बजे असालतन व वकालतन पेश होकर अपना एतराज दर्ज करवा सकता है। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर / एतराज जेरे समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम राजस्व पटवार वृत्त मझीण के महाल तरयामलू में राम सहाई पुत्र खजाना की बजाये राम दास पुत्र खजाना दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 03–02–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
मझीण, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नं0 : 1 / 1 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 25–02–2026

श्रीमती सत्या देवी पुत्री श्री खजाना राम, निवासी गांव भ्रान्ता, डाकघर साई, तहसील थुरल, ग्राम पंचायत भ्रान्ता, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के तहत जन्म पंजीकरण हेतु प्रार्थना–पत्र।

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती सत्या देवी पुत्री श्री खजाना राम, निवासी गांव भ्रान्ता, डाकघर साई, तहसील थुरल, ग्राम पंचायत भ्रान्ता, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में व्यक्तिगत रूप से उपस्थित होकर के प्रार्थना–पत्र मय ब्यान हलफी पेश करते हुए आवेदन किया कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 01–07–1945 को गांव भ्रान्ता, ग्राम पंचायत भ्रान्ता में हुआ है। परन्तु अज्ञानतावश उसके जन्म का पंजीकरण स्थानीय ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में न करवाया गया है। अतः प्रार्थिया इस न्यायालय के माध्यम से अपने जन्म पंजीकरण करने के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत भ्रान्ता को जारी करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रार्थिया का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस इश्तहार मुश्त्री मुनादी द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति या संस्था को उक्त सत्या देवी की जन्म तिथि 01–07–1945 के पंजीकरण बारे किसी प्रकार की आपत्ति या उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 25–02–2026 को हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर एवं एतराज पेश कर सकता है बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व उपरोक्त सत्या देवी की जन्म तिथि 01–07–1945 के पंजीकरण करने का आदेश उप–स्थानीय पंजीकार जन्म व मृत्यु ग्राम पंचायत धमन लाहड को पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 29–01–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं नायब तहसीलदार, भवारना, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

किस्म मुकद्दमा : जन्म / मृत्यु पंजीकरण मुकद्दमा नं0 : 03 / B / 2026

श्रीमती सुशीला कुमारी पुत्री जन्म सिंह, निवासी चौगान, डाकघर डरोह, उप–तहसील भवारना, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रत्यार्थी।

प्रार्थिया सुशीला कुमारी पुत्री जन्म सिंह, निवासी चौगान, डाकघर डरोह, उप–तहसील भवारना, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने अपनी जन्म तिथि जोकि 13–10–1943 को गांव चौगान, डा0 डरोह, ग्राम पंचायत बसकेहड में हुई है, स्थानीय पंचायत में पंजीकृत करवाने हेतु प्रार्थना–पत्र मय हल्फी ब्यान, अति0 जिला पंजीकार (जन्म और मृत्यु) द्वारा अपर्यापता पत्र और मुख्य रजिस्टर शिमला (जन्म और मृत्यु) द्वारा अनुशंसा पत्र सहित पेश किया प्रार्थिया के अनुसार अज्ञानतावश उसकी जन्म तिथि सम्बन्धित पंचायत बसकेहड, उप–तहसील भवारना के अभिलेख में दर्ज न हो सकी है। अब प्रार्थिया न्यायालय के आदेशों से उपरोक्त पंचायत में अपनी जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण करवाना चाहती है।

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार / मुश्त्री मुनादी के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि इस बारे यदि किसी को कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 26–02–2026 को अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर अपना पक्ष रख सकते हैं। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म पंजीकरण करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर व एतराज काबिलेगौर न होगा।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 31–01–2026 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
भवारना, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा नं0 : 05 / 2026 किस्म प्रकरण : जन्म पंजीकरण तारीख पेशी : 28–02–2026

श्रीमती कृष्णा देवी पुत्री श्री नंदा राम, निवासी गांव लोहर पखी, डा0 बैरघाट, तहसील थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रतिवादी।

विषय.––जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(3) के तहत जन्म पंजीकरण हेतु प्रार्थना–पत्र

श्रीमती कृष्णा देवी पुत्री श्री नंदा राम, निवासी गांव लोहर पखी, डा0 बैरघाट, तहसील थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में असालतन हाजिर होकर प्रार्थना–पत्र मय ब्यान हल्फी पेश करते हुए आवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 15–01–1959 को गांव लोहर पखी, डा0 बैरघाट, तहसील थुरल, ग्राम पंचायत बैरघटा, जिला कांगड़ा में हुआ है, परन्तु अज्ञानतावश उसके जन्म का पंजीकरण स्थानीय ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में न करवाया गया है। अतः प्रार्थी इस न्यायालय के माध्यम से अपने जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत बैरघाट को जारी करवाना चाहती है।

अतः प्रार्थी का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस इश्तहार मुस्त्री मुनादी द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति या संस्था को उपरोक्त की जन्म तिथि 15–01–1959 के पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 28–02–2026 को हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर व एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व उपरोक्त श्रीमती कृष्णा देवी पुत्री श्री नंदा राम की जन्म तिथि को पंजीकृत करने के आदेश उप–स्थानीय पंजीकार, जन्म व मृत्यु, ग्राम पंचायत बैरघाट को पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 28–01–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
थुरल, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 : 821815 / 2026 तारीख मजरूआ : 27–01–2026 तारीख पेशी : 25–02–2026

श्री धर्म चंद पुत्र श्री तितर राम पुत्र टैहकू, निवासी महाल कनोल, मौजा खावा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. फरीकदोयम।

दरख्वास्त बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती।

श्री धर्म चंद पुत्र श्री तितर राम पुत्र टैहकू, निवासी महाल कनोल, मौजा खावा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने अदालत में दिनांक 27–01–2026 को प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए निवेदन किया है कि प्रार्थी का वास्तविक नाम धर्म चंद है व प्रार्थी के पिता का वास्तविक नाम तितर राम है, परन्तु प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल कनोल में धर्म सिंह दर्ज हो चुका है व प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल कनोल में तितर दर्ज हो चुका है, जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है। प्रार्थी ने अपने प्रार्थना–पत्र के समर्थन में आबाहन पत्र तलवाना, नकल जमाबन्दी, स्वघोषणा पत्र, परिवार नकल, लाईसैन्स व आधार कार्ड साथ संलग्न कर रखे हैं। अब प्रार्थी ने अपने व अपने पिता के नाम की दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित करने हेतु आग्रह किया है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख महाल कनोल में प्रार्थी का नाम धर्म सिंह के स्थान पर धर्म चंद पुत्र श्री तितर राम पुत्र टैहकू, निवासी महाल कनोल, मौजा खावा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) व राजस्व अभिलेख

महाल कनोल में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम तितर के स्थान पर तितर राम पुत्र टैहकू, निवासी महाल कनोल मौजा खावा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 25–02–2026 को 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बसूरत गैरहाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी और नाम दुरुस्ती दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––––

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 : 821814 / 2026 तारीख मजरूआ : 27–01–2026 तारीख पेशी : 25–02–2026

श्री अविनाश कुमार पुत्र श्री महिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र चन्दू, निवासी महाल जुखनेहड़, मौजा जिखली कोठी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. फरीकदोयम।

दरख्वास्त बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती।

श्री अविनाश कुमार पुत्र श्री महिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र चन्दू, निवासी महाल जुखनेहड़, मौजा जिखली कोठी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने अदालत में दिनांक 27–01–2026 को प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए निवेदन किया है कि प्रार्थी का वास्तविक नाम अविनाश कुमार है, परन्तु प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल जुखनेहड़ में अविनाश दर्ज हो चुका है, जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है। प्रार्थी ने अपने प्रार्थना–पत्र के समर्थन में आबाहन पत्र तलवाना, नकल जमाबन्दी, स्वघोषणा पत्र, परिवार नकल, शिक्षा प्रमाण–पत्र व आधार कार्ड साथ संलग्न कर रखे हैं। अब प्रार्थी ने अपने नाम की दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित करने हेतु आग्रह किया है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख महाल जुखनेहड में प्रार्थी का नाम अविनाश के स्थान पर अविनाश कुमार पुत्र श्री महिन्द्र सिंह पुत्र चन्दू, निवासी महाल जुखनेहड़, मौजा जिखली कोठी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 25–02–2026 को 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बसूरत गैरहाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी और नाम दुरुस्ती दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 : 821813 / 2026 तारीख मजरूआ : 27–01–2026 तारीख पेशी : 25–02–2026

श्री विशम्बर दास पुत्र श्री परस राम पुत्र जोधा, निवासी महाल खपरेड़, मौजा कंडी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. फरीकदोयम।

दरख्वास्त बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती।

श्री विशम्बर दास पुत्र श्री परस राम पुत्र जोधा, निवासी महाल खपरेड़, मौजा कंडी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने अदालत में दिनांक 27–01–2026 को प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए निवेदन किया है कि प्रार्थी के पिता का वास्तविक नाम परस राम है, परन्तु प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल खपरेड़ व महाल घरलाहड़ में पैसु दर्ज हो चुका है, जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है। प्रार्थी ने अपने प्रार्थना–पत्र के समर्थन में आबाहन पत्र तलवाना, नकल जमाबन्दी, स्वघोषणा पत्र, परिवार नकल, पैन कार्ड व आधार कार्ड साथ संलग्न कर रखे हैं। अब प्रार्थी ने अपने पिता के नाम की दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित करने हेतु आग्रह किया है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख महाल खपरेड़ व महाल घरलाहड़ में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम पैसु के स्थान पर पैसु उपनाम परस राम पुत्र जोधा, निवासी महाल खपरेड, मौजा कंडी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 25–02–2026 को 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बसूरत गैरहाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी और नाम दुरुस्ती दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

———————

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 : 821811 / 2026 तारीख मजरूआ : 27–01–2026 तारीख पेशी : 25–02–2026

श्री करतार चंद पुत्र श्री संत राम पुत्र सुजानू, निवासी महाल व मौजा दनोहा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. फरीकदोयम।

दरख्वास्त बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती।

श्री करतार चंद पुत्र श्री संत राम पुत्र सुजानू, निवासी महाल व मौजा दनोहा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने अदालत में दिनांक 27–01–2026 को प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए निवेदन किया है कि

प्रार्थी का वास्तविक नाम करतार चंद है व प्रार्थी के पिता का वास्तविक नाम संत राम है, परन्तु प्रार्थी का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल दनोहा में करतार सिंह दर्ज हो चुका है व प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल दनोहा में सन्तू दर्ज हो चुका है, जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है। प्रार्थी ने अपने प्रार्थना–पत्र के समर्थन में आबाहन पत्र तलवाना, नकल जमाबन्दी, स्वघोषणा पत्र, परिवार नकल, पैन कार्ड व आधार कार्ड साथ संलग्न कर रखे हैं। अब प्रार्थी ने अपने व अपने पिता के नाम की दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित करने हेतु आग्रह किया है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख महाल दनोहा में प्रार्थी का नाम करतार सिंह के स्थान पर करतार चंद पुत्र श्री सन्तू उपनाम संत राम पुत्र सुजानू, निवासी महाल व मौजा दनोहा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) व राजस्व अभिलेख महाल दनोहा में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम सन्तू के स्थान पर सन्तू उपनाम संत राम पुत्र सुजानू, निवासी महाल व मौजा दनोहा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 25–02–2026 को 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बसूरत गैरहाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी और नाम दुरुस्ती दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 : 821810 / 2026 तारीख मजरूआ : 27–01–2026 तारीख पेशी : 25–02–2026

श्रीमती ममता कुमारी पुत्री श्री राम प्रकाश पुत्र श्री गोरखू राम, निवासी गांव गोबर नन्द, मौजा थाना बरग्रां, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) हाल पत्नी अशोक कुमार, निवासी गांव गोबर नन्द, मौजा थाना बरग्रां, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता .. फरीकदोयम।

दरख्वास्त बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती।

श्रीमती ममता कुमारी पुत्री श्री राम प्रकाश पुत्र श्री गोरखू राम, निवासी गांव गोबर नन्द, मौजा थाना बरग्रां, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) हाल पत्नी अशोक कुमार, निवासी गांव गोबर नन्द, मौजा थाना बरग्रां, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने अदालत में दिनांक 27–01–2026 को प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए निवेदन किया है कि प्रार्थिया का वास्तविक नाम ममता कुमारी है, परन्तु प्रार्थिया का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल गोबर नन्द, महाल तरखानकड़, महाल गढ़ी, महाल थाना, महाल बालू व महाल उप्रैड़ में ममता देवी दर्ज हो चुका है, जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है। प्रार्थिया ने अपने प्रार्थना–पत्र के समर्थन में आबाहन पत्र तलवाना, नकल जमाबन्दी, स्वघोषणा पत्र, परिवार नकल, शिक्षा प्रमाण पत्र, पैन कार्ड व आधार कार्ड साथ संलग्न कर रखे हैं। अब प्रार्थिया ने अपने नाम की दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित करने हेतु आग्रह किया है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख महाल गोबर नन्द, महाल तरखानकड़, महाल गढ़ी, महाल थाना, महाल बालू व महाल उप्रैड़ में प्रार्थिया का नाम ममता देवी के स्थान पर ममता कुमारी पुत्री श्री राम प्रकाश पुत्र श्री गोरखू राम, निवासी गांव गोबर नन्द, मौजा थाना बरग्रां, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 25–02–2026 को 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बसूरत गैरहाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी और नाम दुरुस्ती दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मिसल नं0 : 82189 / 2026 तारीख मजरूआ : 27–01–2026 तारीख पेशी : 25–02–2026

श्री मनोज कुमार पुत्र श्री सत्य पाल पुत्र मोती, निवासी महाल मंगलेरा, मौजा लुहणा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. फरीकदोयम।

दरख्वास्त बाबत नाम दुरुस्ती।

श्री मनोज कुमार पुत्र श्री सत्य पाल पुत्र मोती, निवासी महाल मंगलेरा, मौजा लुहणा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने अदालत में दिनांक 27–01–2026 को प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत करते हुए निवेदन किया है कि प्रार्थी के पिता का वास्तविक नाम सत्य पाल है, परन्तु प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल मंगलेरा व महाल हारडू में सतपाल दर्ज हो चुका है, जोकि गलत दर्ज हुआ है। प्रार्थी ने अपने प्रार्थना–पत्र के समर्थन में आबाहन पत्र तलवाना, नकल जमाबन्दी, स्वघोषणा पत्र, परिवार नकल, शिक्षा प्रमाण पत्र व आधार कार्ड साथ संलग्न कर रखे हैं। अब प्रार्थी ने अपने पिता के नाम की दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित करने हेतु आग्रह किया है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी भी व्यक्ति को राजस्व अभिलेख महाल मंगलेरा व महाल हारडू में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम सतपाल के स्थान पर सतपाल उपनाम सत्य पाल पुत्र मोती, निवासी महाल मंगलेरा, मौजा लुहणा, तहसील बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) के नाम दुरुस्ती करने बारे में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 25–02–2026 को 10.00 बजे इस अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। बसूरत गैरहाजिरी एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी और नाम दुरुस्ती दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ है।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
बडोह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

Office of the Assistant Collector 1st Grade-*cum*-Tehsildar-*cum*-Land Reforms Officer
Tehsildar Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.)

Case Sub-Type : Section 37 of H.P. Land Revenue Act, 1954.
Nature of Case : Correction of Revenue Entry
Case No./Year : 703545/2025 Date of Hearing : 13-02-2026

In the matter of :

Smt. Rajni Sharma d/o Sh. Tulsi, aged about 55 years resident of Mohan Chhatter/332, P.O. Jalpehar, Tehsil Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

Versus

General Public ..*Respondent*.

PROCLAMATION/PUBLIC NOTIC

Whereas, the above-named applicant has filed an application under Section 38 of the Himachal Pradesh Land Revenue Act, 1954 before this Court seeking correction of her name in the revenue record pertaining to Mohan Chhatter/332, Tehsil Joginder nagar, District Mandi, H.P.

And whereas, it has been submitted that the applicant's name is recorded as "Rajni Sharma" in the revenue record, while her name is recorded as "Shalini Bhatia" in Aadhar Card, PAN Card, Voter ID Card and other official documents, and that both names belong to one and the same person.

Now, therefore, notice is hereby given to the Respondent *i.e.* General Public and to all concerned persons that if anyone has any objections to the proposed correction of the applicant's name as "Rajni Sharma alias Shalini Bhatia" in the revenue record of the aforesaid Mohal, they may file their objections in writing before this Court on or before the date fixed. Failing which it shall be presumed that no objection exists, and the application shall be decided *ex-parte* in accordance with law.

Issued under my hand and seal of this Court.

Seal. Sd/-
Assistant Collector 1st Grade,
Tehsildar Joginder Nagar, District Mandi (H.P.).

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)

शीर्षक :

श्री सुख लाल पुत्र चन्दू, निवासी गांव व डाकघर भोजपुर, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रत्यार्थीगण।

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र अन्तर्गत धारा 37 हि0 प्र0 राजस्व अभिलेख 1954 बराये किये जाने दुरुस्ती कागजातमाल वाक्या मुहाल भोजपुर / 26 / 6 तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी हि0 प्र0 करने बारे।

श्री सुख लाल पुत्र चन्दू, निवासी गांव व डाकघर भोजपुर, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में बराये मुहाल भोजपुर / 26 / 6 के खाता / खतौनी नम्बर 842 / 1172 खसरा नम्बर 771 व 772 रकबा तादादी 170–16 वर्ग मीटर मुहाल भोजपुर / 26 / 6 में पंजाब खादी उद्योग संघ बतौर किरायेदार दर्ज की दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है। अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त किसी भी प्रकार का कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 10–02–2026 को मुकर्रर तारीख पर बवक्त 10.00 बजे सुबह असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें, अन्यथा आपके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

नोटः– तहसील जमादार को भेजकर लिखा जाता है कि इश्तहार की एक प्रति उप–मण्डलाधिकारी (ना0) सुन्दरनगर के नोटिस बोर्ड पर व एक प्रति पटवार वृत्त के नोटिस बोर्ड व एक प्रति आम चौराहा पर व एक प्रति तहसील कार्यालय के नोटिस बोर्ड पर चस्पान करके अमल मे लाई जाये।

आज दिनांक 24–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता (प्रथम श्रेणी),
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)

शीर्षक :

नूर अहमद पुत्र फतेह मुहम्मद निवासी गांव डीनक डाकघर कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, (हि0 प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3), जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण करने बारे।

आवेदक श्री नूर अहमद पुत्र फतेह मुहम्मद, निवासी गांव डीनक, डाकघर कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, (हि0 प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3), जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969, मय District Registrar (Birth & Death)-*cum*-Chief Medical officer Mandi द्वारा जारी पत्र तथा अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र तथा दो गवाहन के शपथ–पत्र आदि सहित प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 12–06–1967 को गांव डीनक, डाकघर कनैड़ तहसील सुन्दरनगर जिला मण्ड़ी, हि0प्र0 में हुआ है, परन्तु उक्त तिथि का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है। आवेदक अपनी जन्म तिथि 12–06–1967 का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत कनैड़, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्ड़ी हि0प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारा किसी को भी किसी प्रकार का कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28–02–2026 को मुकर्रर तारीख पर बवक्त 10.00 बजे सुबह असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें अन्यथा आपके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

———————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)

शीर्षक :

बरकत बीबी पुत्री मोहम्मद हुसैन निवासी गांव डीनक, डाकघर कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, (हि0 प्र0) .. प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3), जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम 1969 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण करने बारे।

आवेदिका बरकत बीबी पुत्री मोहम्मद हुसैन निवासी गांव डीनक डाकघर कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3), जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969, मय District Registrar (Birth & Death-*cum*-Chief Medical officer Mandi द्वारा जारी पत्र, तथा अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र तथा दो गवाहन के शपथ–पत्र आदि सहित प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 01–08–1967 को गांव डीनक, डाकघर कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 में हुआ है, परन्तु उक्त जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है। आवेदिका अपनी जन्म तिथि 01–08–1967 का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत कनैड, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हि0प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारा किसी को भी किसी प्रकार का कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28–02–2026 को मुकर्रर तारिख पर बवक्त 10.00 बजे सुबह असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें, अन्यथा आपके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)

शीर्षक :

आवेदिका किरण देवी पत्नी श्री सुरेन्द्र मुखिया r/o Village Chargwan P.O. Chilvaniya, Tehsil Madhubani, District West Champaran, Bihar at present residing in the house of Sh. Durga Dass s/o Dhungal Ram r/o Kharsi, P.O. Bhojpur, Tehsil Sundernagar, District Mandi, H.P. .. प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रत्यार्थी।

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3), जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत पंजीकरण करने बारे।

आवेदिका किरण देवी पत्नी श्री सुरेन्द्र मुखिया r/o Village Chargwan, P.O. Chilvaniya, Tehsil Madhubani, District West Champaran, Bihar at present residing in the house of Sh. Durga Dass s/o Dhungal Ram r/o Kharsi P.O. Bhojpur Tehsil Sundernagar District Mandi H.P. ने इस न्यायालय में आवेदन पत्र अधीन धारा 13(3), जन्म एवं मृत्यु अधिनियम, 1969, मय Addl. District Registrar (Birth & Death)- *cum*-District Health Officer Mandi द्वारा जारी पत्र तथा नगर परिषद द्वारा जारी अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र तथा दो गवाहन के शपथ–पत्र आदि सहित प्रस्तुत किया है कि उसकी पुत्र Miss. Diya d/o Surender Mukhiya का जन्म दिनांक 06–01–2013 को गांव खारसी, डाकघर भोजपुर, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हि0 प्र0 में हुआ है, परन्तु उक्त जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण नगर परिषद सुन्दरनगर, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हि0प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं है। आवेदिका अपनी पुत्री की जन्म तिथि 06–01–2013 का पंजीकरण नगर परिषद सुन्दरनगर, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी, हि0प्र0 के अभिलेख में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारा किसी को भी किसी प्रकार का कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 24–02–2026 को मुकर्रर तारीख पर बवक्त 10.00 बजे सुबह असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें, अन्यथा आपके खिलाफ एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 23–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H. P.)

In the matter of :

Smt. Pravina Devi w/o Sh. Kailash Chand, r/o Village Dashmala (Daran), P.O. Dofda, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above-named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of his daughter's name from "ANANYA" to "ANYA" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to change their name as "ANYA d/o Sh. KAILASH CHAND" in place of " ANANYA d/o Sh. KAILASH CHAND ", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 01-03-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard, and name will be recorded accordingly.

Issued today on 30th day of January, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal.

HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, (HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H. P.)

In the matter of :

Smt. Pouki Devi w/o Sh. Mohan Lal, r/o Village Sari, P.O. Kandi, Tehsil Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla, Himachal Pradesh . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

PROCLAMATION REGARDING CORRECTION OF NAME

Whereas, the above-named applicant has submitted an application for the correction of her daughter's name from "PANKI DEVI" to "POUKI DEVI" in the records of the Aadhar Card and all other relevant documents associated with the applicant.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to change their name as "POUKI DEVI w/o Sh. MOHAN LAL" in place of " PANKI DEVI w/o Sh. MOHAN LAL", they should appear before the undersigned on or before 01-03-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent/pleader.

In the event of their failure to do so, order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard, and name will be recorded accordingly.

Issued today on 30th day of January, 2026 under my hand and seal of the Court.

Seal.

HARSH AMRENDER SINGH, (HAS),
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Rampur Bushahr, District Shimla (H.P.).

ब अदालत श्री विष्णु नेगी, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, कोटगढ़, उप–तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

वाद संख्या : 80524 / 2026 तारीख दायर : 17–01–2026 किस्म वाद : दुरुस्ती नाम

श्री आसी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री प्रेम चंद, निवासी गांव कोटिधार, डाकघर भूट्टी, उप–तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) .. वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रतिवादी।

हिमाचल प्रदेश भू–राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत भूमि खाता नं0 199, 196 स्थित महाल भूट्टी, हदबस्त नं0 3, जमाबंदी साल 2021–2022, पटवार वृत्त भूट्टी, उप–तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) में अपने स्व0 पिता श्री प्रेम चंद (प्रिमा) के नाम की दुरुस्ती बारे प्रार्थना–पत्र।

सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि वादी श्री आसी राम पुत्र स्व0 श्री प्रेम चंद, निवासी गांव कोटिधार, डाकघर भूट्टी, उप–तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) द्वारा इस राजस्व कार्यालय में दिनांक 17–01–2026 को हिमाचल प्रदेश भू–राजस्व अधिनियम, 1954 की धारा 37 के अन्तर्गत एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत कर आग्रह किया है कि उनके पिता का नाम भूमि खाता नं0 199, 196 स्थित महाल भूट्टी, हदबस्त नं0 3, जमाबंदी साल 2021–2022, पटवार वृत्त भूट्टी, उप–तहसील कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0) में श्री प्रिमा पुत्र श्री थंकू पुत्र श्री ब्रेस्तू दर्ज है जोकि गलत दर्ज है जबकि उनके पिता का सही नाम श्री प्रेम चंद पुत्र श्री थंकू पुत्र श्री ब्रेस्तू है जिसकी पुष्टि के लिए वादी द्वारा परिवार नकल, मृत्यु प्रमाण–पत्र, आधार कार्ड, शपथ–पत्र, नकल जमाबंदी हाल संलग्न प्रार्थना–पत्र कर रखी हैं। वादी अपने स्व0 पिता श्री प्रेम चंद का नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में प्रिमा के स्थान पर प्रेम चंद दुरुस्त करवाना चाहता है।

अतः समस्त आम जनता को इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम उक्त राजस्व अभिलेख में दुरुस्त करने बारे किसी का किसी भी प्रकार का उजर या एतराज हो तो वह अधोहस्ताक्षरी के कार्यालय में दिनांक 22–02–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे से सायं 5.00 बजे तक

असालतन या वकालतन पेश कर सकता है। निर्धारित समय में यदि किसी का कोई उजर या एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता है तो इस वाद में नियमानुसार वांछित दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 22–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुए।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
कोटगढ़, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

In the Court of Sh. Daya Nand Sharma Executive Magistrate, Grade-II, Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Smt. Prabha Mehta d/o Sh. Amar Chand now w/o Late Sh. Hans Raj, r/o Village Nasari, P.O. Summerkoti, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondent.*

Subject.—Application under section 13 (3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969.

Smt. Prabha Mehta d/o Sh. Amar Chand now w/o Late Sh. Hans Raj, r/o Village Nasari, P.O. Summerkoti, Tehsil Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.) has filed an application alongwith affidavit in the court of the undersigned under section 13(3) of the Birth & Death Registration Act, 1969 to enter her date of Birth 29-09-1976 in the record of Birth Register of Gram Panchayat Karasa.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding to enter the date of Birth of Prabha Mehta they should appear before the court of undersigned within 30 days from the publication of this notice, either personally or through their authorized agent.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there is no objection and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heard.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 22nd January, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-
(DAYA NAND SHARMA),
Executive Magistrate, Grade-II,
Rohru, District Shimla (H.P.).

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, सरस्वतीनगर, उप–तहसील सरस्वतीनगर, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

मिसल नं0	तारीख मरजुआ	उप–तहसील	जिला
806029 / 2025	04–12–2025	सरस्वतीनगर	शिमला

श्रीमती वलासु देवी उर्फ गुड्डी पुत्री श्री काना सिंह हाल पत्नी श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह, निवासी गांव सास्कीर, डाकघर सोलंग, उप–तहसील सरस्वतीनगर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) वादिया।

नोटिस बनाम

आम जनता

दरख्वास्त नाम दुरुस्ती सेहत इन्द्राज राजस्व रिकार्ड उप–महाल नगाली–शाशन, लुदाड़ा–शाशन व महाल पन्द्राणू पटवार वृत्त पन्द्राणू में सही दर्ज कराने बारे।

यह दरख्वास्त श्रीमती वलासु देवी उर्फ गुड्डी पुत्री श्री काना सिंह हाल पत्नी श्री राजेन्द्र सिंह, निवासी गांव सास्कीर, डाकघर सोलंग, उप–तहसील सरस्वतीनगर, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0) ने इस कार्यालय में शपथ–पत्र सहित स्वयं प्रस्तुत होकर निवेदन किया है कि प्रार्थिया का उप–महाल नगाली–शाशन, लुदाड़ा–शाशन व महाल पन्द्राणू पटवार वृत्त पन्द्राणू में मलकीयत आराजी है जिसमें प्रार्थिया का नाम गुड्डी है जोकि गलत दर्ज है। प्रार्थिया ने पुष्टि हेतु परिवार नकल, आधार कार्ड, पैन कार्ड व स्वयं सत्यापित ब्यान हल्फिया की प्रति आवेदन पत्र के साथ संलग्न की है। प्रार्थिया अपना नाम उपरोक्त वाका चक उप–महाल नगाली–शाशन, लुदाड़ा–शाशन व महाल पन्द्राणू के मालकागजात में गुड्डी के स्थान पर वलासु देवी उर्फ गुड्डी दुरुस्त / दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस अदालती इश्तहार द्वारा सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त प्रार्थिया का नाम उप–महाल नगाली–शाशन, लुदाड़ा–शाशन व महाल पन्द्राणू पटवार वृत पन्द्राणू, उप–तहसील सरस्वती नगर के मालकागजात में गुड्डी के स्थान पर वलासु देवी उर्फ गुड्डी दुरुस्त करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह दिनांक 13–02–2026 को दोपहर 02.00 बजे इस अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकते हैं। बाद गुजरने मियाद कोई भी उजर / एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा नियमानुसार वादी का नाम दुरुस्त करने के आदेश पारित किए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 16–01–2025 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर एवम् मोहर न्यायालय से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
सरस्वतीनगर, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत श्री अनिल कुमार नयाब तहसीलदार / कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

इन्दिरा देवी पुत्री श्री मोहर सिंह, निवासी गांव तनाश, डाकघर व तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 के तहत ग्राम पंचायत के जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत करने बारा।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा देवी पुत्री श्री मोहर सिंह, निवासी गांव तनाश, डाकघर व तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने प्रार्थना–पत्र गुजार कर निवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 12–12–1977 को हुआ था। इस सन्दर्भ में प्रार्थिया ने अपना शपथ–पत्र भी संलग्न किया है परन्तु अज्ञानता के कारण प्रार्थिया व उसके परिवार के किसी सदस्य ने निश्चित अवधि में इन्दिरा देवी पुत्री श्री मोहर सिंह जन्म पंजीकरण स्थानीय ग्राम पंचायत थाना ननखरी के अभिलेख में दर्ज नहीं करवाया है। अब प्रार्थिया ग्राम पंचायत थाना ननखरी के जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर में पंजीकरण दर्ज करवाना चाहती है। प्रार्थिया ने अपना ब्यान हल्फिया (स्वयं सत्यापित) परिवार नकल व सचिव द्वारा अप्राप्यता प्रमाण–पत्र प्रस्तुत कर अनुरोध किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि जन्म व मृत्यु पंजीकरण रजिस्टर सम्बन्धित ग्राम पंचायत रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज किया जावे।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता तथा सम्बन्धित रिश्तेदारों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को उपरोक्त जन्म के पंजीकरण का सम्बंधित ग्राम के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारा कोई एतराज हो तो दिनांक 19–02–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन / वकालतन हाजिर होकर लिखित व मौखिक एतराज पेश करे अन्यथा उजर / एतराज पेश न होने की सूरत में ग्राम पंचायत थाना ननखरी को जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण करने के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 20–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(अनिल शर्मा),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील ननखरी, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, उप–तहसील धमवाड़ी,
जिला शिमला, हिमाचल प्रदेश

श्रीमती चन्दर कान्ता पत्नी श्री बिसम्वर सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर पेखा, उप–तहसील धमवाड़ी, तहसील चड़गांव शिमला हि0प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

उनवान मुकद्दमा.–– जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 की धारा 13(2 / 3) तथा हि0प्र0 जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण नियम 9 (2 / 3)

दरख्वास्त जेरे धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969 श्रीमती चन्दर कान्ता पत्नी श्री बिसम्वर सिंह, निवासी गांव व डाकघर पेखा, उप–तहसील धमवाड़ी, तहसील चड़गांव शिमला हि0 प्र0 ने दरख्वास्त गुजारी है कि वह अपने पुत्र उज्जवल रिखवान के जन्म का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत पेखा रजिस्टर में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है। प्रार्थिया का कहना है कि वह अज्ञानतावश अपने पुत्र के जन्म का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत पेखा के जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्टर मे दर्ज नहीं करवा सकी। अब वह अपने पुत्र के जन्म का पंजीकरण उपरोक्त पंचायत में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है। प्रार्थिया के पुत्र की जन्म तिथि 12–06–2018 है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति या रिश्तेदार को इस बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह अपना एतराज असालतन या वकालतन मिति 23–02–2026 को प्रातः 10:00 बजे अदालत हजा में हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है। उक्त तारीख के बाद कोई भी एतराज स्वीकार नहीं किया जाएगा और उक्त प्रार्थिया के पुत्र के जन्म का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत पेखा के जन्म एवं मृत्यु रजिस्टर में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 23–01–2026 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर मोहर अदालत सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
धमवाड़ी, जिला शिमला (हि0 प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

दावा सं0 : 12 / 13 ऑफ 2025 तारीख मजरुआ : 23–04–2025

श्री संजय कुमार पुत्र श्री (जालमू) जालम सिंह, निवासी गांव टिपरिया, डा0 वासनी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 35 ता 38 हि0 प्र0 भू–राजस्व अधिनियम, 1953.

श्री संजय कुमार पुत्र श्री (जालमू) जालम सिंह, निवासी गांव टिपरिया, डा0 वासनी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में धारा 35 ता 38 के अन्तर्गत अपने नाम संजय कुमार की दुरुस्ती करने हेतु आवेदन–पत्र गुजार रखा है कि प्रार्थी का नाम संजय कुमार है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा टिपरिया, उप–तहसील नारग में संजीव कुमार दर्ज है। अब प्रार्थी अपना नाम राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा टिपरिया, उप–तहसील नारग में दुरुस्त करवा कर संजीव कुमार के स्थान पर संजय कुमार दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति आम या खास को प्रार्थी का नाम संजय कुमार राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा टिपरिया में संजीव कुमार के स्थान पर संजय कुमार दर्ज करने बारे किसी प्रकार का उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 17–02–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे तक अपना उजर एवं एतराज न्यायालय में पेश कर सकते हैं। गैरहाजिरी की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 22–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

दावा सं0 : 802312 ऑफ 2026 तारीख मजरुआ : 01–01–2026

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह पुत्र श्री माता राम, निवासी गांव कथेड, डा0 मलकोटी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 35 ता 38 हि0 प्र0 भू–राजस्व अधिनियम, 1953.

श्री स्वर्ण सिंह पुत्र श्री माता राम, निवासी गांव कथेड, डा0 मलकोटी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में धारा 35 ता 38 के अन्तर्गत अपने नाम स्वर्ण सिंह की दुरुस्ती करने हेतु आवेदन–पत्र गुजार रखा है कि प्रार्थी का नाम स्वर्ण सिंह है परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा कथेर जडोला, उप–तहसील नारग में सर्वण सिंह दर्ज है। अब प्रार्थी अपना नाम राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा कथेर जडोला, उप–तहसील नारग में दुरुस्त करवा कर सर्वण सिंह के स्थान पर स्वर्ण सिंह दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति आम या खास को प्रार्थी का नाम स्वर्ण सिंह राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा कथेर जडोला में सर्वण सिंह के स्थान पर स्वर्ण सिंह दर्ज करने बारे किसी प्रकार का उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 17–02–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे तक अपना उजर एवं एतराज न्यायालय में पेश कर सकते हैं। गैरहाजिरी की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 27–01–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

In the Court of Sh. Rama Nand Ghanolta, Assistant Collector-IInd Grade-cum**- Naib-Tehsildar, Nahan, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Case No. 803152/2026 Nature of Case: Correction of Revenue record

Sh. Deepak Kumar son of Sh. Bhullu Ram, r/o Village Katola, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. . . *Applicant*.

Versus

General Public . . *Respondents.*

Application for correction of name of his father namely Bhullu Ram in place of Ram Kishan in revenue record, Mauza Mohliya Katola, Tehsil Nahan.

Whereas, Sh. Deepak Kumar son of Sh. Bhullu Ram, r/o Village Katola, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. has filled an application alongwith affadavit, copy of Jamabandi year 2016-17, Mauza Mohliya Katola, Tehsil Nahan, report gram panchayat Salani Katola, P.O. Sainwala, Nahan, Tehsil Nahan in the court of the undersigned to correct his father, namely Bhullu Ram in place of Ram Kishan in revenue record, Mauza Mohliya Katola, Tehsil Nahan.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding above correction in revenue record Mauza Mohilya Katola, Tehsil Nahan, then they should appear before the court of undersigned on or before 03-03-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent or advocate.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there are no objections and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heared.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 28-01-2026.

Seal. Sd/-
RAMA NAND GHANOLTA,
Assistant Collector-IInd Grade-cum-*Naib-Tehsildar,*
Nahan, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

I In the Court of Sh. Rama Nand Ghanolta, Assistant Collector-IInd Grade-cum**- Naib-Tehsildar, Nahan, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

Case No. 803151/2026 Nature of Case: Correction of Revenue record

Sh. Rattan Lal son of Sh. Hari Ram, r/o Village Katola Gadda, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. . . *Applicant*.

Versus

General Public . . *Respondents.*

Application for correction of name of his father namely Rattan Lal in place of Ram Rattan in revenue record Mauza Mohliya Katola, Tehsil Nahan.

Whereas, Sh. Rattan Lal son of Sh. Hari Ram, r/o Village Katola Gadda, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur, H.P. has filled an application alongwith affadavit, copy of Jamabandi year 2016-17, Mauza Mohliya Katola, Tehsil Nahan, report gram panchayat Salani Katola, P.O. Sainwala, Nahan, Tehsil Nahan, copy of parivar register, copy of bank passbook in the court of the undersigned to correct his father namely Rattan Lal in place of Ram Rattan in revenue record Mauza Mohliya Katola, Tehsil Nahan.

Now, therefore, objections are invited from the general public that if anyone has any objection regarding above correction in revenue record Mauza Mohilya Katola, Tehsil Nahan, then they should appear before the court of undersigned on or before 03-03-2026 either personally or through their authorized agent or advocate.

In the event of their failure to do so, it would be deemed that there are no objections and order shall be passed *ex-parte* without affording any further opportunity of being heared.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 28-01-2026.

Seal.

Sd/-
RAMA NAND GHANOLTA,
Assistant Collector-IInd Grade-cum-*Naib-Tehsildar,*
Nahan, Tehsil Nahan, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Ajay Kumar s/o Sh. Surender Singh, r/o H. No. 58/12, Mohalla Massanpura, Near Kacha Tank Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my minor son's name from Deviansh to Divyansh. Please note.

AJAY KUMAR
s/o Sh. Surender Singh,
r/o H. No. 58/12, Mohalla Massanpura,
Near Kacha Tank Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Love Raj s/o Jhava Ram, r/o V.P.O. Gopalpur, Tehsil Palampur, Gopalpur (15), P.O. & Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 059 declare that I have changed my name in Aadhar Card No. 6728 7785 2466 from Love Raj to Lekh Raj. All concerned please may note.

LOVE RAJ
s/o Jhava Ram,
r/o V.P.O. Gopalpur, Tehsil Palampur,
Gopalpur (15), P.O. & Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 059.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Ritika Joshi d/o Sh. Dharam Raj Jaisi, r/o House. No. 328/7, Upper Street Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.)-173 001 declare that I have changed my name from Ritika Joshi to Ritika Jaisi in my Aadhar Card No. 4911 3385 4410. All concerned please may note.

RITIKA JOSHI
d/o Sh. Dharam Raj Jaisi,
r/o House. No. 328/7, Upper Street Nahan,
Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.)-173 001.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Kirana Devi w/o Sh. Arun Kumar, r/o Village Koon, P.O. Tourkhola, Tehsil Sandhole, Distt. Mandi (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Kirna Devi to Kirana Devi. I shall be known as Kirana Devi for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

KIRANA DEVI
w/o Sh. Arun Kumar,
r/o Village Koon, P.O. Tourkhola,
Tehsil Sandhole, Distt. Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Kamla Devi d/o Jeet Ram w/o Devinder Kumar, r/o Village Rathoha, P.O. Chunahan, Tehsil Balh, Distt. Mandi (H.P.) declare that in PAN Card No. DKJPK1434E my name is wrongly entered as Kamlesh instead of Kamla Devi. All concerned please note.

KAMLA DEVI
d/o Jeet Ram w/o Devinder Kumar,
r/o Village Rathoha, P.O. Chunahan,
Tehsil Balh, Distt. Mandi (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Brahm Dass Dhiman s/o Late Sh. Mangat Ram, r/o Nishant Bhawan Dhanda, P.O. Totu, Tehsil & District Shimla (H.P.) declare that Brahm Dass Dhiman and B.D. Dhiman is the name of one and the same person. All concerned please note.

BRAHM DASS DHIMAN
s/o Late Sh. Mangat Ram,
r/o Nishant Bhawan Dhanda,
P.O. Totu, Tehsil & District Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sneh Latta w/o Sh. Hem Raj, r/o Village Jhinkari, P.O. Mair, Tehsil Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Sabela Devi to Sneh Latta. I shall be known as Sneh Latta for all purposes in future. All concerned please may note.

SNEH LATTA
w/o Sh. Hem Raj, r/o Village Jhinkari,
P.O. Mair, Tehsil Hamirpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Naresh Kumari d/o Sh. Prittam Chand, presently w/o Sh. Gopal Chand, r/o Village Laungni, P.O. Karot, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that in my Aadhar Card bearing number 4667 1149 8238 my name is entered as Babli Devi. Now I have changed my name from Babli Devi to Naresh Kumari. I shall be known as Naresh Kumari for all purposes in future. All concerned please may note.

NARESH KUMARI
d/o Sh. Prittam Chand, presently w/o Sh. Gopal Chand,
r/o Village Laungni, P.O. Karot, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Shaihri w/o Sh. Shibu, V.P.O. Ranol, Sub- Tehsil Jangla, District Shimla (H.P.) declare that my name is wrongly mentioned as Shauri Dei in my Aadhar Card number 4654 8414 2744. Therefore it should be changed to Shaihri in my Aadhar Card. Note the relevant information.

SHAIHRI
w/o Sh. Shibu, V.P.O. Ranol,
Sub- Tehsil Jangla, District Shimla (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Namita Kumari w/o Sapan Dev, Ward No. 3, Village Gander, P.O. Marera, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra (H.P.) declare that my name in my Aadhar Card have wrongly entered as Manita Kumari. Whereas my correct name is Namita Kumari. All concerned please note.

NAMITA KUMARI
w/o Sapan Dev, Ward No. 3, Village Gander,
P.O. Marera, Tehsil Jaisinghpur, District Kangra (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Bimlo w/o Teju, Village Bhalodi, P.O. Ail, Tehsil Churah, District Chamba (H.P.) declare that in my Aadhar Card bearing number 4723 2241 8730 my name is wrongly entered as Roopi, which is incorrect. Whereas my Correct name is Bimlo. I shall be Known as Bimlo for all purposes in future. Please note.

BIMLO
w/o Teju, Village Bhalodi, P.O. Ail,
Tehsil Churah, District Chamba (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Jai Kala w/o Prithvi Bahadur, V.P.O. Jharag, Tehsil Jubbal, Distt. Shimla (H.P.) declare that name of my daughter Srishti is wrongly mentioned as Sharishti in her Aadhar Card No. 5891 3964 7440. Therefore it should be changed to Srishti in her Aadhar Card. Note the relevant information.

JAI KALA
w/o Prithvi Bahadur,
V.P.O. Jharag, Tehsil Jubbal,
Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Smt. Manu Bala w/o Nishant Kumar, r/o Village Mangrer, P.O. Jhikli Ichhi, Tehsil & Distt. Kangra (H.P.) declare that in my son's birth certificate name is Rihaan. I changed his name Rihaan to Gauransh Mongra.

MANU BALA
w/o Nishant Kumar,
r/o Village Mangrer,
P.O. Jhikli Ichhi,Tehsil & Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Singh Ram s/o Sh. Shibba Ram, r/o Village Nagal Suketi, P.O. Moginand, Tehsil Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.)-173 030 declare that I have changed my name from Sing Ram s/o Shiv Ram (old name) to Singh Ram s/o Sh. Shibba Ram (new name) in my Aadhar No. 2413 8740 3121. All concerned please note.

SINGH RAM
s/o Sh. Shibba Ram,
r/o Village Nagal Suketi, P.O. Moginand,
Tehsil Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.)-173 030.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Sharda Devi w/o Ari Sudan Aggarwal, r/o Ward No. 08, P.O. Palampur, Tehsil Palampur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 061 declare that my name has been wrongly mentioned as Sharda Devi Aggarwal. My correct name is "Sharda Devi". Both names refer to one and the same lady. Henceforth, I shall be known by my correct name Sharda Devi for all legal and official purposes.

SHARDA DEVI
w/o Ari Sudan Aggarwal,
r/o Ward No. 08, P.O. Palampur,
Tehsil Palampur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 061.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Gurmej Kaur *alias* Gurmeet Kaur w/o Ajmer Singh, r/o 157/1 Adarsh Colony near SBI Bank Taruwala, Badripur, Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) declare that my correct name is Gurmej Kaur, however my name is mistakenly mentioned as Gurmeet Kaur in the Aadhar Card, which needs to be corrected.

GURMEJ KAUR
w/o Ajmer Singh,
r/o 157/1 Adarsh Colony near SBI Bank Taruwala,
Badripur, Paonta Sahib, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Sher Singh s/o Gokal Chand, r/o Vill. Tinder, P.O. Shawad, Tehsil Anni, Distt. Kullu (H.P.) declare the general public is informed that my name has been mistakenly recorded as "Sher Singh" in my Aadhar Card, whereas my correct name is "Sheru". My name "Sheru" appears in school records, panchayat and all other government documents. "Sher Singh" and "Sheru" refer to the same person only.

Sher Singh
s/o Gokal Chand,
r/o Vill. Tinder, P.O. Shawad,
Tehsil Anni, Distt. Kullu (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Binta w/o Sh. Virender Kumar aged about 32 years, r/o Village Koti (179), Sirmaur (H.P.)-173 027 hereby declare that I have changed my name from Binta (old name) to Banita (new name). All concerned please may note.

BINTA
w/o Sh. Virender Kumar ,
r/o Village Koti (179) ,
Sirmaur (H.P.)-173 027.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Hoshiyar Singh s/o Sh. Manglu Ram, r/o Village Thach, P.O. Khunachi, Tehsil Thunag, Distt. Mandi (H.P.) hereby declare that my name is inadvertently entered as Ses Ram in my Aadhar Card No. 4279 3937 5396, whereas my correct and real name is Hoshiyar Singh which is correctly entered in my other documents *i.e.* school certificate etc. I want my name be corrected as Hoshiyar Singh instead of Ses Ram. All concern please may note.

HOSHIYAR SINGH
s/o Sh. Manglu Ram,
r/o Village Thach, P.O. Khunachi,
Tehsil Thunag, Distt. Mandi (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Amita Devi aged about 47 years w/o Sh. Raj Kumar, r/o Village Panoh, P.O. & Tehsil Nalagarh, Distt. Solan (H.P.) declare that as per documents correct name of my daughter is Riya Rani but in Aadhar Card wrongly written as Ritika Rana. Riya Rani and Ritika Rana refer to one and the same person.

AMITA DEVI
w/o Sh. Raj Kumar,
r/o Village Panoh, P.O. & Tehsil Nalagarh,
Distt. Solan (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Ranjeet Singh s/o Sh. Khemi Ram, r/o Vill. Chehla, P.O. Darwin, Tehsil & Distt. Chamba (H.P.) declare that in Aadhar Card of my minor daughter, having number 2164 5251 2073, her name is wrongly entered as Anadita, whereas her correct name is Anandita. All concerned please may note.

RANJEET SINGH
s/o Sh. Khemi Ram,
r/o Vill. Chehla, P.O. Darwin,
Tehsil & Distt. Chamba (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Sita Kumari d/o Chambel Singh w/o Jaber Singh, r/o Vill. Kavkhi Khangog, P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Narag, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.)-173 033, declare that my correct name is Sita Kumari which is properly recorded in my other record, but in my Aadhar Card No. 2464 4978 9726 my name is wrongly recorded as Kumari Sita, above both the names are of one and the same person, hence my correct name Sita Kumari be entered in my Aadhar Card. All concerned please note.

SITA KUMARI
d/o Chambel Singh w/o Jaber Singh,
r/o Vill. Kavkhi Khangog,
P.O. & Sub-Tehsil Narag, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Manjeet Singh s/o Sh. Shamsher Singh, r/o Vill. Rampur, P.O. Kaulanwala Bhood, Tehsil Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.) have changed the name of my son as Riyansh Thakur (new name) from old name Reyaansh Thakur.

MANJEET SINGH
s/o Sh. Shamsher Singh,
r/o Vill. Rampur, P.O. Kaulanwala Bhood,
Tehsil Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Shiv Kumari w/o Sh. Tikka Ram aged 55 years, r/o Jiya Lal Building, Khatik Mohalla, Laxmi Narayan Temple Totu, Tehsil & Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 011 declare that I have changed my name from Ship Kumari (old name) to Shiv Kumari (New name) all concerned please may note.

SHIV KUMARI
w/o Sh. Tikka Ram ,
r/o Jiya Lal Building, Khatik Mohalla, Laxmi Narayan Temple,
Totu, Tehsil & Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Nirmala Kumari Awasthi w/o Om Prakash Awasthi, r/o Village Khilru, P.O. Bindraban, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)-176 061 declare that my name has been wrongly mentioned as Nirmala Awasthi, my correct name is Nirmala Kumari Awasthi. Both names refer to one and the same lady. Henceforth, I shall be known by my correct name Nirmala Kumari Awasthi for all legal and official purposes.

NIRMALA KUMARI AWASTHI
w/o Om Prakash Awasthi,
r/o Village Khilru,
P.O. Bindraban, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Ishran Devi w/o Late Sh. Maan Chand, r/o Vill. Bangher, P.O. Bharoli Kutiara, Teh. Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Ishari Devi to Ishran Devi for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

ISHRAN DEVI
w/o Late Sh. Maan Chand,
r/o Vill. Bangher,
P.O. Bharoli Kutiara, Teh. Jawalamukhi,
Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Neeraj Soni s/o Raj Dev Soni, r/o Ward No. 3, MC Rohru, P.O. & Teh. Rohru, Distt. Shimla (H.P.) declare that name of my daughter Vaishnavi Kumari is wrongly mentioned as Sandhya Kumari in her Aadhar Card No. 2332 8208 0060. Therefore it should be changed to Vaishnavi Kumari. Note the relevant information.

NEERAJ SONI
s/o Raj Dev Soni,
r/o Ward No. 3, MC Rohru,
P.O. & Teh. Rohru, Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Yashpal s/o Late Sh. Uttam Chand, Vill. Chhupari, P.O. Lowerkoti, Teh. Rohru, Distt. Shimla (H.P.) declare that my name is wrongly mentioned as Jaspal Singh in my Aadhar Card No. 4553 0754 6066. Therefore it should be changed to Yaspal in my Aadhar Card. Note the relevant informatiom.

YASHPAL
s/o Late Sh. Uttam Chand,
Vill. Chhupari, P.O. Lowerkoti,
Teh. Rohru, Distt. Shimla (H.P.).

कार्मिक विभाग

(नियुक्ति–II)

अधिसूचना

शिमला–02, 7 फरवरी, 2026

संख्याः पर(एपी–बी)बी0(15)–6 / 2024.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश लोक परीक्षा (अनुचित साधन निवारण) अधिनियम, 2025 (2025 का अधिनियम संख्यांक 45) की धारा 1 के उप–धारा (2)

द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, 09 फरवरी, 2026 को ऐसी तारीख के रूप में, जिससे पूर्वोक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध प्रवृत्त होंगे, नियत करते हैं।

आदेश द्वारा,

हस्ताक्षरित / –
(एम. सुधा देवी),
सचिव (कार्मिक)।

———————

[Authoritative English Text of this Department Notification No. Per (AP-B)B(15)-6/2024, dated 07-02-2026 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].

PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT

(Appointment-II)

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 7th February, 2026

No. Per(AP-B)B(15)-6/2024.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 1 of the Himachal Pradesh Public Examination (Prevention of Unfair Means) Act, 2025 (Act No. 45 of 2025), the Governor, Himachal Pradesh is pleased to appoint the 9th February, 2026 as the date on which the provisions of the aforesaid Act shall come into force.

By order,

Sd/-
(M. SUDHA DEVI),
Secretary (Personnel).

———————

हिमाचल प्रदेश चौदहवीं विधान सभा

अधिसूचना

शिमला–171 004, दिनांक 07 फरवरी, 2026

सं0:वि0स0–विधायन–प्रा0 / 1–1 / 2023.–राज्यपाल महोदय का निम्नलिखित आदेश दिनांक 07 फरवरी, 2026 सर्वसाधारण को सूचनार्थ प्रकाशित किया जाता है:––

"मैं, शिव प्रताप शुक्ल, राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश, भारतीय संविधान के अनुच्छेद 174(1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों के अनुसरण में हिमाचल प्रदेश चौदहवीं विधान सभा के ग्यारहवें सत्र का आह्वान सोमवार

दिनांक 16–02–2025 को अपराह्न 02.00 बजे से हिमाचल प्रदेश विधान सभा, शिमला में समवेत होने के लिए करता हूँ।

शिव प्रताप शुक्ल
राज्यपाल,
हिमाचल प्रदेश।"

आदेश द्वाराः–

यशपाल शर्मा
सचिव,
हि0प्र0 विधान सभा।

HIMACHAL PRADESH FOURTEENTH VIDHAN SABHA

NOTIFICATION

Shimla–171 004, the 7th February, 2026

No.V.S.-Legn.-Pri/1-1/2023.—The following order by the Governor of the State of Himachal Pradesh, dated the 7th February, 2026 is hereby published for general information:–

"In exercise of the powers conferred upon me by virtue of clause (1) of Article 174 of the constitution of India, I, Shiv Pratap Shukla, Governor of Himachal Pradesh, hereby summon the Fourteenth Vidhan Sabha to meet for its Eleventh Session at 02.00 PM on Monday, the 16-02-2026, in the Himachal Pradesh Vidhan Sabha, Shimla.

Shiv Pratap Shukla,
Governor,
Himachal Pradesh."

By Order:–

Yash Paul Sharma
Secretary,
H.P. Vidhan Sabha.

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला–5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित
इलेक्ट्रॉनिक हस्ताक्षरित राजपत्र, वैबसाइट https://rajpatra.hp.gov.in पर उपलब्ध है एवम् ऑनलाइन सत्यापित किया जा सकता है।